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Abstract

The aim of the thesis is to examine contemporary constructions of mixed race in the United States and Britain through the examination of two types of racial projects: the national census and voluntary and community organisations focused on mixed race. Using a combination of critical discourse analysis and qualitative interviews, the research analyses the ways in which mixed race is being described, conceptualised, and constructed through macro- and meso level racial projects in each nation, in order to compare the racial formation processes that are occurring in the early twenty-first century’s “mixed race moment.”

The thesis builds upon racial formation theory, which argues that the concept of “race” is never fully fixed, but rather is made through socio-historical processes that create, inhabit, transform, and destroy racialised notions over time and context (Omi and Winant 1986, 1994, 2015). The theory examines the struggles over racialised meanings that occur between macro-level and micro-level racial projects. This thesis aims to fill the gap left by this focus through examining racial projects that occupy the socio-political “middle ground” between macro- and micro-level projects: the “meso-level.”

The research examines the ways in which the state constructs mixed race in the United States and Britain. Each nation’s census allowed for mixed race self-identification in 2000 and 2001, respectively. The thesis examines the social, historical, and political processes that led to mixed race options at that particular time. It argues that the ways in which the census organisations report upon mixed race functions as a discursive practice that provides an official construction of mixed race through simultaneously reflecting and shaping racialised descriptions and narratives within each nation.

The thesis examines the usefulness of “meso-level” projects by exploring the role of mixed race organisations in racial formation processes through the examination of six meso-level mechanisms of racialisation: social identity, social capital, collective action, idioculture, extended networks, and civil society (Fine 2012). Incorporating Michel Foucault’s notion of “governmentality” (Gordon 1991), the thesis highlights the ways that mixed race organisations have interacted directly and indirectly with macro-level bodies during and after the addition of the mixed race census options as well as other routes of interaction specific to each national context. The thesis argues that the racialisation that occurs at the macro-level holds a “default” role with which mixed race organisations then engage. This highlights the relative roles of power the institutions have in each national context and the ways they are managed through relations fostered through governmentality. The thesis also examines the discourses used by mixed race organisations in the US and Britain as meso-level racial projects and poses the argument that the varied usage of multiple racialised paradigms leads to an increased relative fluidity in the constructions of mixed race than their respective macro-level projects.

The systematic cross national comparison of the ways mixed race is constructed in the US and Britain highlights the ways in which both macro-level and meso-level organisations articulate and promote racialised ideology through their relative levels of power in society. By analysing and comparing these racial projects and their interactions, the paradigms and discourses used reveal the particularities and overlaps by these organisations as they contest, negotiate, and accept formations of mixed race.
Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright Statement

i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and she has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property University IP Policy (see http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24420, in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library’s regulations (see http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/about/regulations/) and in The University’s policy on Presentation of Theses.
Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who contributed to my research experience. Many thanks to the research participants, who gave their time to speak with me and share their personal experiences and opinions. I would also like to extend gratitude to my supervisory team. Professor James Nazroo and Dr. Bridget Byrne have been a great source of guidance and support throughout the duration of my programme. Additionally, I would like to thank Professor Peter Lawler and Dr. Stuart Shields, who have also offered me their time and support, and Dr. Virinder Kalra, who provided guidance to me during my first year. I extend a special acknowledgement to Ms. Ann Cronley, who wonderfully supports us students immeasurably.

I would like to acknowledge the different academic cohorts that I have been privileged to be a part of throughout my PhD programme. Thank you to all my colleagues in the Black Europe Research Group. I extend much gratitude to Professor Stephen Small for taking the time to provide feedback and advice for my research. I am also grateful for the academic support and friendship of Dr. Mitsy Chanel-Blot and Ms. Nadine Golly. I am also grateful for my Critical Mixed Race Studies colleagues, who have been great sources of support and comradery. In particular, Dr. Jennifer Sims and Dr. Myra Washington have kept me going with encouragement and tough love.

I also would like to acknowledge my Peckham writing group, which kept me on track and provided support and input over the last several years. In particular, I am thankful to João Coelho, Natoyah Epailly, Melody Raines, Farah Rahman, and Levi Newman for being consistent and supportive writing buddies.

A special acknowledgement to Linda Frost, Rita Contreras Cruz, and my lovely grandmother, Rose Njaka: three beautiful women who encouraged me greatly along this journey, but sadly have passed away before its end.

Last but not least, I am forever grateful to my family, who have provided unwavering love and support throughout my programme. This work is dedicated to them.
Chapter One: Introduction

Around the turn of the twenty-first century, various media in the United States of America and Great Britain began covering a “Mixed Race Baby Boom” (Arlidge 2004; Elam 2011; Root 1992, 1996a; Spencer 1999, 2004). An example of this is journalist John Arlidge’s article from the Observer entitled, “Forget Black, Forget White. EA [Ethnically Ambiguous] is What’s Hot.” In it, he profiled a “whole new generation” of young people in the United States and Britain that identify as mixed race. The close of the article states, “‘We are the new mix. We are the remix generation,’” which summarises the now-common celebrations of novel and “progressive” identification as being mixed race, opposed to “traditional” racialised categories framed as outmoded (Arlidge 2004). Reports such as this one declared mixedness as a new phenomenon that heralded the breaking down of racialised borders and built bridges towards harmony between racialised groups (as argued in: Elam 2011; Sexton 2008; Spencer 1999, 2006, 2010, 2011). Mixed race voluntary and community organisations (VCOs) in both the US and Britain increased in numbers and popularity throughout the 1990s and 2000s, as organisers expressed an increasing desire for recognition and representation within mainstream racialised consciousness (Bullock 2010; DaCosta 2007; Douglass 2003; Graham 1995; Hamako 2005; Nakashima 1996; Olumide 2002; Williams 2006). In some cases, this went as far as advocacy and campaigning for representation at governmental levels (Bullock 2010; Caballero 2004; DaCosta 2007; Elam 2011; Fernández 1996; Graham 1995, 1996; Perlmann and Waters 2002; Williams 2005). Results from Census 2000 (US) and the 2001 British census appeared to confirm these assertions, as “mixed race” populations were documented as “the fastest growing” of all the racialised group options (Bradford 2006; Jones and Bullock 2012; Jones and Smith 2001). However, when considering the social and political contexts of both Britain and the United States, it becomes clear that racialised mixedness has been present in both societies throughout their histories. As such, this particular “mixed race moment” of claiming a new importance and significance of racialised mixedness in both nations raises some interesting questions: how and why is the notion of “mixed race” being constructed as a new and unprecedented
phenomenon despite the well-documented constructions throughout both national histories?

Amid this moment, social scientists have also been researching various issues pertaining to mixed race, in the wake of the popular narrative of the supposed novelty of mixed race in the twenty-first century. In response, numerous contemporary mixed race anthologies exploring mixed race identity and various lived experiences stemming from this racialised category were published in the 1990s and early 2000s (e.g., Ifekwunigwe 2004; Parker and Song 2001; Perlmann and Waters 2002; Root 1992, 1996a; Williams-León and Nakashima 2001; Winters and DeBose 2003; Zack 1995a). From personal identity, to socialisation, to the processes by which “mixed race” became self-enumerable on the censuses; this era of mixed race scholarship in the US and Britain has comprised and shaped the majority of English-language work in the global canon. In contrast to earlier writings from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that pathologised racialised mixture (e.g., Dover 1937; Gobineau 2004; Knox 1850; Stonequist 1937), recent work has frequently attempted both implicitly and explicitly to construct an alternative, “positive” discourse that celebrates and empowers this “new demographic.” At the same time—and seemingly in tension—some of this research has also simultaneously highlighted areas of need and support “specific” for the population (Elam 2011; Ifekwunigwe 2004; Olumide 2002; Root 1992, 1996a; Spencer 2010).

It is within this context that I frame my research on the processes of mixed race construction in the United States and Britain. The documented British and US American histories of both colonisation and involuntary/voluntary mass migration—and the subsequent sexual contact or partnering—are in clear contrast to the newer discourses being generated by the government, mixed race organisations, some academics, and others with wide influence and/or authority in society. For example, advocates for mixed race classification on the national censuses support the claim that mixed race is a new phenomenon that began or increased in the middle of the twentieth century. Furthermore, they further support their claims through the
reported increasing numbers in population and identification (e.g., Linehan 2000; Root 1992,1996a). However, as Kerry Ann Rockquemore explains:

Despite advocates’ claims, biracial-ness is not a newly emergent social phenomenon. The Census is merely the latest manifestation of the ongoing socio-historical problematic of classifying mixed-race people in the United States. […] The Census issue provides a contemporary variation on the classification dilemma.


Although speaking about the US specifically, the same can be applied to the discourses in Britain. Both nations have a long history of racialised groups coming together through colonisation and enslavement practices. Sexual contact and procreation has always been a part of those interactions. So the claim that racialised mixedness is somehow new is ahistorical and naïve (Mahtani 2014; R. Spencer 2004, 2014; Williamson 1995). It is precisely this discursive influence that I want to investigate, as their contemporary constructions of mixed race have been widely accepted—even by some academics—commonly without being carefully analysed for their assumptions and implications (Daniel et al. 2014; R. Spencer 2004, 2014).

In this introductory chapter, I start by contextualising my research within the area of Critical Mixed Race Studies (CMRS), which is important to my research because of its particular orientation toward mixed race theorisation. Following this contextualisation, I will give an overview of the aims and scope of my research. I will then pose my research questions and outline my research methodology. I will move on to clarify my use of terminology. Finally, the chapter will close with chapter summaries, which will map the trajectory of the thesis.

**Critical Mixed Race Studies**

Critical Mixed Race Studies is a relatively recent label coined to describe the global canon of social research focusing on racialised mixedness (Daniel et al. 2014). Formerly known as Mixed Race Studies, in a sixty-page article, G. Reginald Daniel, Laura Kina, Wei Ming Dariotis, and Camilla Fojas write an extensive literature review encompassing the last thirty-five years. In it, they chart the “critical turn” of mixed race scholarship over the years. They also provide justification for the addition of
“critical” to the body of research to indicate both the new directions of centring mixed race research and the “recursive and self-reflexive” reconsiderations of previous studies (Daniel et al. 2014: 7, 8).

CMRS incorporates race critical theories (also referred to as critical race studies), which aim to prioritise “race” as a subject for social inquiry around racialised disparities (Daniel et al. 2014; Essed and Goldberg 2002). As Philomena Essed and David Theo Goldberg argue in their justification of a race critical orientation:

> We are suggesting that we are trying to capture something central to the social and political theory of modernity, something very basic especially about late modern social and political life, in refusing to ignore racial conditions and racist expressions. These cannot be taken for granted or assumed away, because they reference so much else in social life. […] So critical theory necessarily requires a focus, among others, on race; and racial theory cannot help but be, in a normative sense, critical. Race, critique, and theory, we want to insist, are constitutive of the possibilities of thinking each other in any satisfactory way. We insist, thus, on taking race critically and theory race-critically. […] We do not intend this as a play of words, but as an indication of a specific theoretical disposition.


I agree that it is necessary to be critical when considering “race”—carefully questioning assumptive labels and meanings—as it not only reflects the social, historical, and political influences of society; it also reflects the power influences at work in society. Some of these influences include the construction and categorisation of people groups, the rights that they are afforded, social opportunities and attainment, and discrimination. Focusing on how race works in conjunction with these influences in a race critical manner will not only help to identify the ways in which society functions at different levels, but will ultimately help promote social change.

Although research of a more race critical nature has increased within mixed race scholarship recently, much of the early research from the 1980s and 1990s focuses significantly on positive, celebratory narratives. These narratives attempt to counter the dominant pathological narratives of mixed race preceding them from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yet, upon reflection through later
scholarship, some CMRS scholars have argued that they are less critical or even uncritical in their understandings and analyses of mixedness (Daniel et al. 2014; Gordon 1995; R. Spencer 2004, 2014).

In spite of the goals to recursively and reflexively revisit and build upon previous scholarship, there still remains themes within CMRS that require further, race critical interrogation. Most of the work within CMRS purports to have a social constructionist orientation to race that has become mainstream within the social sciences today. Nevertheless, encountering slippage to biological and cultural assumptions in the use and conceptualisation of race remains frequent (Bullock 2010; Spencer 2004). Whilst it is my position that it is too broad of a brushstroke to consider these studies entirely “uncritical,” a majority of foundational texts adopted notions of “mixed race” with little interrogation of the concept. An example of this phenomenon can be found in the influential “Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People,” penned by Maria P. P. Root (1996c). Although an important statement for the advocacy of mixed race identification, imbued in the twelve statements are references to “race” that accept, rather than challenge, racialised categorisation and the presumed meaningful distinctions among them. This can especially be seen in the second “right,” which states, “I Have The Right Not to Keep the Races Separate Within Me” (Root 1996c: 8; title case as written in original). Here, she accepts the notion of separate races, rather than critiques the underlying premises of racialised purity upon which “separate”—and subsequently “mixed”—races rely. In this and other publications (e.g., Alibhai-Brown 2001; Frazier 2002; Olumide 2002; Ratliff and Sutherland 2015; Root 1992, 1996a; Zack 1995a; Zarembka 2007), there is little to no attempt to problematise racialised categorisation in practice. The result is to reify notions of race that are simultaneously argued to be destabilised by the acknowledgement of mixed racialisation. While there has been subsequent empirical research that has turned to examining aspects of the implications of mixedness (e.g., Aspinall 2003, 2009, 2010; Aspinall and Song 2013; Brunsma 2006; DaCosta 2007; Edwards et al. 2012; King-O’Riain et al. 2014; Parker and Song 2001; Rockquemore and Brunsma 2002, 2008; Rockquemore et al. 2009;
Song 2010; Song and Aspinall 2012), there is still little research that specifically examines the social processes that contribute to the constructions of mixedness under scrutiny.

Racial formation theory, which I will further outline in Chapter Two, provides a good starting point for race critical enquiry into the racialising processes of mixed race. Michael Omi and Howard Winant developed racial formation theory as a way to examine the processes and methods of the social construction of race over time and within different contexts. The theory has been used variously to examine both specific racialised categories and the interactions among them (e.g., HoSang et al. 2012; Omi and Winant 1986, 1994, 2015; Small 1994a), however there has been little investigation of racialised mixedness. Additionally, racial formation theory has been used previously to examine specific contexts at a specific moment or over time (e.g., Almaguer 2012; Lee 2012; Smith 2012), but there has been little systematic comparison across national contexts. One notable exception to these two gaps is in the work of Chamion Caballero, who used racial formation theory to examine what she calls “mixed race projects” in the United Kingdom and the United States of America (Caballero 2004). Although she identified particular sites of mixed race construction, her examination focused more on analysing the ways various projects contributed to mixed race constructions and less on examining the underlying methods and discourse used by mixed race projects to construct meaning(s) to mixed race. Subsequently, there remains scope for the development of racial formation theory to include examinations of mixedness, and along comparative, cross-national lines.

Indeed, Howard Winant encourages sociologists to develop racial formation theory for the twenty-first century:

To tackle the themes of race and racism once again in the new millennium, sociology must develop more effective racial theory. Racial formation approaches can offer a starting point here. The key tasks will be the formulation of a more adequate comparative historical sociology of race, the development of a deeper understanding of the micro-macro linkages that shape racial issues, and the recognition of the pervasiveness of racial politics in
contemporary society. [...] The field must not shrink from addressing it.


Mixed race is a particularly key area of consideration for the development of racial theory and for the examination of racialised thinking in the twenty-first century. Understanding how mixed race is constructed in a comparative analysis will help to examine the distinctive social situations that influence divergent trajectories of racial formation, as well as the similarities of constructions across time.

Further, as I will also outline and argue in Chapter Two, I aim to develop racial formation theory through introducing and testing the usefulness of meso-level racial projects. As originally developed, racial formation theory in particular examines macro-level and micro-level racial projects. I propose examining middle-ground racial projects, which I propose operate in addition to, and in conjunction with, the “micro-macro linkages” that Winant describes in the above quotation. Meso-level racial projects help to provide further nuance and contribute to further understanding of the different ways social organisations shape and contest racialisation processes.

RESEARCH SCOPE

Race is not a stagnant or fixable concept, but one that is fluid over time and location (Omi and Winant 1986, 1994, 2015). In order to pursue an examination of the multifaceted racialising practices that have occurred in both the US and Britain since the 1990s, I will be examining macro-level and meso-level organisations in order to explore aspects of racialised fluidity. I orient my research focus on groups and institutions that use their influence to create and promote racialised constructions in everyday life. Racial formation theory is particularly useful to examine the ways by which influential collective actors in two different national contexts created parallel, influential, and ahistorical constructions of a “new” mixed race. Systematic cross-national comparative research will explore the commonalities and points of distinction between the two nations. This will give insight to the mechanisms and strategies utilised by top- and mid-level organisations to inform racialisation processes.
My research examines how mixed race has been constructed since the 1990s to present. In this research, I focus on the trajectories of race in two nations: the United States of American and Great Britain. In particular, I am interested in focusing on the roles of what could be called “macro-level” institutions and “meso-level” organisations, as they have been important factors in the rise of the “Mixed Race Baby Boom” discourses (Rockquemore 1998; Spencer 2004, 2011). Two particularly salient bodies that act as racial projects in creating these discourses are that of the national census (a macro-level institution) and mixed race voluntary and community organisations (meso-level groups).

Both the United States and Britain conduct decennial censuses that are organised by the state. The US Census Bureau (within the Office of Management and Budget) and the Office for National Statistics, respectively, oversee the enumeration of the entire national population, census data analysis, and information dissemination to various organisations and members of the public. The census process is an authoritative representative exercise1, conducted on behalf of the state. The questions and categories are decided upon by organisation officials, with the results used to create a “snapshot” of the nation. The categories used by census bodies are “officialised” through their use as the default racialised categories for other state organisations (e.g., education, family services, and health organisations). Additionally, they are often adopted by various non-governmental bodies (e.g., companies, voluntary and community organisations), and in layperson usage. These data influence the ways that citizens see and categorise themselves, as they are largely restricted to the categories designated by the state to represent themselves (Anderson 1991; Kertzer and Arel 2002). Thus, the state has a significant role in setting the parameters for its people vis-à-vis personal and collective identity. Consequently, only a certain number of groups are constructed as meaningful and distinct in the society, thereby contributing to and maintaining social stratification. Responses outside of the provided group options are either

---

1 The accuracy of representation is limited by the documented disproportional undercounting of racialised minorities in both nations (See: Choldin 1994; Prewitt 2000; Simpson 2003; Teague 2000).
recategorised to recognised groups or omitted entirely, further reifying the provided racialised options (Anderson 1991; Kertzer and Arel 2002; Perlmann and Waters 2002).

As well as influence from the macro level, meso-level organisations also play a role in racialisation processes. Mixed race organisations in both nations vary in aims and goals, however what they share is that they are organised around the notion of mixed race. I will provide details about how I identified these organisations in Chapter Three, and explore their aims in goals in Chapters Five and Six. Organisations aim to create relationships and notions of social identity among people who identify as mixed race. Whilst some organisations have that as their primary end, others build upon social identity towards further goals. Some organisations have explicitly political aims and therefore mobilise campaigns for their desired categorisation and advocate for representation at government levels. Some provide moral and/or material support through meetings, courses, and training aimed towards individuals racialised as mixed, whereas others use the internet and social media to disseminate information and promote collective identity. Although on a lesser scale and through different mechanisms to the census bodies, I argue that mixed race organisations are also examples of influential bodies that set themselves out as representatives to create and promote their own racialised notions of mixed race. In their work of advocacy, campaigning, familial and social support, and education; a few individuals take on the role of the leadership of many, towards a “unified position.” As Michele Elam notes, mixed race organisations put forth claims on behalf of mixed race individuals:

Such organizations claim to be representative of and responsible to a larger number of people eager and poised to be identified and rallied. In that sense, the community they are trying to reach, to whom they are beholden, is as much a construction as a discovery.

Elam 2011: 8.

In a similar manner to the census bodies, mixed race organisations are also constructing notions of mixed race through influencing practices of defining the racialised groups that they purport to represent, as well as creating a collective voice or position for them. However, unlike census bodies that are responsible
solely to the state, mixed race organisations have a different relationship with those being represented. While certainly some organisations are more connected to the work of the state than others (e.g., those that do advocacy and campaigning work), the additional sense of responsibility toward those being represented places the dynamics of mixed race organisations at a level that lies somewhere between the impersonal state level of racial project and an interpersonal type of interaction.

The individual and interpersonal micro-level also is a site for racial formation. However, my research will focus on meso-level and macro-level racial projects in order to examine how racialisation happens within the context of collectivity and institution, respectively. In particular, I am interested in examining how influence shapes the way that mixed race is constructed at medium- and large-scale levels, and the ways that these bodies engage with one another to contextualise and corroborate notions of mixedness.

**Research Questions**

In the United States and Great Britain, the present mixed race moment has at times constructed the notion of “mixed race” as an emergent and unprecedented phenomenon, despite various constructions throughout both nations’ histories (as critiqued in: Elam 2011; Mahtani 2014; Rockquemore 1998; R. Spencer 1999, 2004, 2011, 2014). The United States and Britain both have histories of colonialism and trans-Atlantic enslavement that created situations for racialised encounter. However, both nations have differing trajectories of racialised mixedness throughout their histories that at times overlap and at times are distinct from one another, to be further discussed in the following chapter. Focusing on the census and mixed race organisations as two influential bodies with power that shapes racialisation leads to my following research questions:

- How do census organisations in the United States and Britain utilise discourses to construct the concept of “mixed race”?
- How do macro-level and meso-level organisations in the United States and Britain engage with each other in order to form constructions of mixed race?
How do meso-level mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain conceptualise and operationalise the construction of “mixed race”?

I have engaged with current race and mixed race theory and built upon existing research in order to develop an effective way to address these questions. In the research, and as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three, I used a facet methodological approach (Mason 2011) to analyse the constructions of mixed race in the US and Britain. I examined the census racial projects by using critical discourse analysis of the official documents disseminated by the Office of Management and Budget (US) and the Office for National Statistics (GB). These documents detail the census findings on mixed race, and through the critical discourse analysis, I exposed the underlining racialisation processes that function through these means of communication. I supplement these findings with interviews of representatives from each organisation, which moved beyond the official text of the documents and provided a complementary, more nuanced position for each organisation. I relied on narrative analysis for the mixed race organisations in the US and Britain. Using semi-structured interviews, I asked each participant specific questions around descriptions and conceptions of mixed race in order to understand the construction processes.

As mentioned above, Omi and Winant outline two types of sites for racial formation: macro-level and micro-level racial projects. Both types use signifying practices as ways to form and structure social inequality. For my research, the national census bodies are an example of a macro-level racial project; one that occurs at structural, institutional levels. The state is one of the highest-level institutions within national borders and plays a key role in determining categories that are widely used in other data collection processes. Subsequently, this makes it a significant level on which to focus for my investigation. In contrast, mixed race organisations do not fit well within a macro- or micro-level designation. Micro-level racial projects are reserved for personal interactions between individuals, into which mixed race organisations also do not quite fit. I argue that racial formation theory needs to be extended to include examination of meso-level projects so that relative levels of influence and
power can be analysed and compared in racialisation processes. Mixed race organisations share some of the characteristics of macro-level projects; they are (smaller-scale) institutions and play a role in the process of mixed race construction through influence and representation. However, mixed race organisations are not large-scale institutions and have a limited reach of influence within the greater population. Some operate on smaller local or regional scales, and all of them have some form of interaction with those who they aim to represent. Creating a continuum of macro-, meso-, and micro-level racial projects may help to understand the racialisation processes that occur in institutions that have some elements of macro- and micro-level projects, or that may otherwise not neatly fit at either pole. My research tests out the meso-level racial project designation as one of influence, power, and representation.

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY
For the purposes of my research, I am electing to use racialised terminology to refer to the racialisation processes and the social constructions to which the labels refer, opposed to an imagined meaning of biological and cultural significance. I use the term “mixed race” to describe the notion of having ancestry from more than one of the official and socially-understood racialised categories for either/both nation(s) in question. I have chosen “mixed race” because it tends to be the most frequently used and understood term among the different populations and organisations in both national contexts. Additionally, for the purpose of analysing these data in two countries that at times employ distinct terminologies, I prefer to use a term that is not biased towards the choice of official terminology for one institution/organisation at the expense of the others. I acknowledge that using “mixed race” is potentially problematic due to the nature of this research project and my positions and understandings of race as a social-historical construction. However, as yet, there is no universal convention for discussing the phenomenon of race without employing racialised terminologies.

As has become convention for some scholars (DaCosta 2007; Elam 2011; Sexton 2008; Spencer 2011), and due to my personal preferences and frequency of the
terminology, I will not be using “scare quotes” around each instance of this or other racialised phrases, as they can be cumbersome and distracting. Nonetheless, it should be assumed that in all my uses of racialised terminology, I do so with an intention of representing them as social constructions, with the term “so-called” implied. Moreover, “mixed race people” refers to individuals who either self-identify as “mixed race” or are identified by affinitive others (i.e., parents or guardians for minor children) as such.

The term “mixed race organisation” refers to groups that have organised at the community level in order to provide support to and/or advocacy for people who either identify as mixed race, or otherwise have affinitive relationships or connections with the ethos of such groups. By adopting this term, I am merely employing the terminology most commonly accepted and understood by such organisations, and am not necessarily subscribing to their definitions of the concept of “mixed race.”

Despite my usage of everyday racialised terminology, I want to remain mindful and critical about the meanings behind the terminology. My race critical lens drives the approaches I used to create my research design, particularly in my desire to contribute to the growing canon of Critical Mixed Race Studies.

CHAPTER SUMMARIES
The next chapter, Chapter Two, further situates my research questions within contemporary mixed race literature. Beginning with an historical account of mixed race, I position my research within the larger context of the early problematic constructions of mixed race and the ways that more contemporary discourses have responded to those early legacies in both nations. I situate my research within the “Critical Mixed Race Studies” literature, as I share concerns (see: Elam 2011; Spencer 1999, 2011; Mahtani 2014; Sexton 2008) about the positive and at times celebratory research, which precedes CMRS literature and which fails to interrogate the construction of racialised categories. I then provide a detailed overview of racial formation theory. I argue that its priority of racialised social positioning makes it a
logical framework for understanding how mixed race is being constructed in the modern day. In line with the theory, I conceptualise the census organisations as a state macro-level racial project. However, one gap that I identify is that in the extant theory, there is not an adequate theorisation around potential racial projects that do not function in society with the levels of influence and power of the state level, but also do not fall into the other end of the binary of individuals at the micro-level. In order to address this gap, I propose to examine mixed race organisations as a meso-level racial project. Presuming a middle-ground status in terms of power, authority, and influence, my research will examine the usefulness of such a concept in understanding further the racialisation processes that occur both within the meso-level organisations and in their interactions with macro-level organisations. Following this, I will also outline a cross-national comparative framework, which will help to refine understanding of racialisation processes through highlighting similarities and differences in two national contexts.

Chapter Three turns to the research methodology, which is situated within the racial formation and cross-national comparative theoretical frameworks covered in the preceding chapter. I explain the race critical lens through which I approached my methodology, in order to address my specific research questions. I used a race critical positioning in order to contextualise my research as work that is not merely describing, but is critiquing through problematisation and interrogation of the processes that underlie the constructions of mixed race. Subsequently, my points of focus will be to examine the specific discourses generated within the state and mixed race organisations to describe and construct mixed race.

I then turn to explain my research methods. Relying on facet methodology (Mason 2011), I gathered data through two approaches in order to examine different, complimentary aspects of mixed race construction. My interest in discourses led me to conduct a discourse analysis of census reports in order to explore the manner in which mixed race is described and constructed in the US and Britain. For the mixed race organisations, in order to address both how they construct mixed race and to understand their views on the state and their interactions with it, I
conducted semi-structured interviews with organisation representatives in each nation. I include details of the US and British censuses and the mixed race organisations, and review my experience in approaching them. Using framework analysis (Ritchie and Lewis 2003), I uncovered themes that influence the descriptions and conceptions of mixed race at each organisation.

The fourth chapter examines the census reports published by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the United States and the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in Britain. I explore how the national census is an important strategy to create, shape, and maintain racialised notions within a national context. Focusing on the reporting of mixed race, I analyse the documents for content as well as assumptive positions in order to understand both the ways that mixed race is described and the way that mixed race is conceptualised through discourse. The main findings in these analyses highlight the overall distinct ways that the US and Britain use discursive practices to conceptualise mixed race. I argue that the censuses in the US and Britain articulate constructions of mixed race that then shape the ways that the rest of each nation’s institutions and population understand, accept, and/or contest mixed race. They do this in their specific enumeration processes by the ways they create and define categories. They further do this in the official discourses they produce through public reports that profile groups racialised as mixed. As becomes apparent, the racialised categorisations at the state level are not mere descriptions of data. The aims of the census include providing a racialised narrative of the population—imbued with meanings and social consequences—and providing a framework within which individuals are allowed to categorise and be recognised.

Chapters Five and Six build the case for the usefulness of meso-level sites through analyses of mixed race organisations and the particular mechanisms they use—as meso-level organisations—in racial formation processes. Building on Gary Alan Fine’s (2012) exploration of the importance of meso-level sociology, I develop his six mechanisms to examine specifically how mixed race organisations use the different strategies in their operations. In Chapter Five, informed by Michel
Foucault’s work on governmentality (the “art” or “rationality” of governance [Gordon 1991]), I specifically analyse the mixed race organisations’ accounts of their interactions with the state during and after the addition of the mixed race question to each national census. Following this, I turn to examine other potential ways of engagement (e.g., through funding, commission, and partnership) specific to each nation. I argue that these types of interactions are important to the racialisation processes, as it is in these encounters where racialised meanings are inhabited, contested, and transformed through racial formation (Omi and Winant: 1986, 1994, 2002, 2015).

I posit that the racialisation of mixed race by the state through discourses around the census hold a “default” role with which other organisations then engage. This reflects the relative roles of power the institutions have in a given national context. These relationships are managed, at least in part, through relations fostered through governmentality. Governmentality acknowledges the state as a non-neutral entity that aims to “conduct the conduct” of its constituents (Gordon 1991: 2). Subsequently, as meso-level organisations, mixed race organisations both directly and indirectly interact with the macro-level bodies.

The sixth chapter moves from direct interactions with macro-level bodies to a focus on the discursive practices of mixed race organisations as meso-level racial projects. I begin the chapter by exploring meso-level racialisation mechanisms that focus on intragroup processes and goals. Following this analysis, I examine the ways in which organisation representatives describe and construct notions of mixed race throughout my interviews with them. In particular, I highlight the variety of racialised paradigms employed by the organisations that lead to a relative fluidity in racialised constructions, in contrast to their respective state entities. At times, these paradigms also include some tendencies to fall back on discourses that are reminiscent of the pathological constructions from previous centuries.

The final chapter, Chapter Seven, reviews and reflects on the research findings and attempts to synthesise them to draw out further implications. Returning to the
original context of the “Mixed Race Baby Boom,” I use the similarities and contrasts of the racialisation processes in the US and Britain to explore the current moment in each nation at the macro- and meso-levels. Further, I provide reflection on the wider implication of introducing the concept of a meso-level racial project in the study of racial formation, as well as the use of cross-national comparisons to refine understandings of culturally-specific racialising processes. I close the chapter by reflecting on limitations I have identified in the study and looking forward to further opportunities for related mixed race research.
Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework

Chapter Overview

In the introduction, I outlined a new “mixed race moment” in the United States and Great Britain. Since the 1990s, popular narratives and some scholarship have constructed notions of “mixed race” as a “new” phenomenon with new terminologies, despite the long histories of racialised mixedness throughout their respective colonial histories. Examples of this can be seen in volumes on mixed race with titles such as: *Creating the New Racial Order: How Immigration, Multiracialism, Genomics, and the Young Can Remake Race in America* (Hochschild et al. 2012) and *The New Colored People: The Mixed Race Movement in America* (J. Spencer 1997), as well as in the name of the no-longer-active consultancy firm, New Demographic, which provided workshops and trainings around mixed race for companies and individuals. In actuality, however, racialised mixedness is not a new phenomenon. What is new are the celebratory articulations of mixed race that have been in mass and social media and the theoretical underpinnings of mixed race scholarship since the 1990s that reflect and encourage popular interest.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore some of the theorisation and research from both the United States and Great Britain, pertaining specifically to issues of mixed race construction. I will begin with an overview of historical literatures. This will identify themes, notions, and attitudes to help contextualise the trajectories of thought that continue to influence mixed race constructions today in both nations. Following the historical overview, I will turn to examine current, general themes of mixed race theories and research from both nations in order to contextualise my empirical study. By reviewing the general themes, I will have exposed the gaps in this still relatively young field of research that my research will address.

Following on from the review of mixed race literatures, I will introduce racial formation as the key theoretical framework for the thesis. I will detail the main tenants of the theory, as well as engage with the ways that it has been used, developed, and critiqued over the last thirty years. This will serve to contextualise
the shifting descriptions and constructions of mixed race throughout the socio-political histories of the United States and Britain by examining mixed race construction within the theoretical framework of racial formation.

Lastly, I will discuss the use of cross-national comparison as a conceptual tool for understanding racialisation processes. I will draw both on the work of scholars who have researched race generally, and mixed race specifically, within the United States and Britain. I will highlight the bases on which the two nations are comparable. This section will outline the cross-national comparative framework for the research. The framework will use the history of racialised relations and the substantial literature within both contexts as a basis to examine the similarities and discontinuities of mixed race construction within each nation (Small 1994a).

**Mixed Race Literature**

Issues of race and mixed race have been around since the first colonial encounters between Europe and Africa, Asia, and the Americas, where there have been anxieties around the mixing of “race” and preserving assumed notions of a “pure” white European race (Small 1994a; Young 1995). Therefore, despite some of the popular opinions underpinning the current mixed race moment, mixed race itself is not a new phenomenon. What is novel are the particular ways that mixed race is currently being constructed, categorised, and discussed in the present moment (Small and King-O’Riain 2014). Highlighting these particular changes point toward the shifting constructions of mixed race over time and provide an important perspective through which to examine race and racialisation processes in contemporary society (Parker 2004; Small and King-O’Riain 2014; S. Spencer 2014).

An important implication to notions of *mixed* race is that it is constructed in contrast to assumptions of discrete, *pure* races. These assumptions are based on mistaken—though still widespread—notions of essentialised difference and homogeneity among groups of people with certain phenotypic characteristics (Olumide 2002; S. Spencer 2014). When carefully interrogated, notions of mixed
race can help to critique ideas and supposed criteria of racialised purity. Research on race and racialisation has been developing over many decades. However, it is only relatively recently, from around the late 1980s and early 1990s, that researchers have shifted their focus specifically to mixed race identity and experience, away from the largely negative assumptions of inferiority and pathological conditions (Caballero 2004; Parker and Song 2001; Spencer 2011; Young 1995; Zack 1993). In examining mixed race construction, research can investigate the similarities and distinctions in assumptions, descriptions, and conceptions for specific contexts within society. Uncovering this information is important in order to better understand mixed race construction and racialisation processes, and how they function in shaping racialised understandings.

Although a good portion of the writings on mixed race come from the United States and Britain\(^2\) at the moment, no one national experience or history should be regarded as paradigmatic (Ifekwunigwe 1999; King-O’Riain et al. 2014; Parker and Song 2001; Edwards et al. 2012). Though the two nations have some linked and parallel histories (e.g., aspects of colonial and enslavement histories), the two nations also have distinct aspects of their histories that contribute to the shaping of mixed race theory and construction in both locations. Both in similarity and in contrast, the histories and current developments in the USA and Britain continue to influence and inform each other. The particular ways that mixed race has been constructed in each nation can reflect upon both the salient similarities and salient distinctions in the socio-historical processes of creating mixed race in each nation.

In this section, I explore some of the theorisation and research from both the US and Britain pertaining to issues of mixed race construction. An overview of the historical research helps to explore and understand the trajectory of thought that continues to influence the shaping of mixed race construction today. In both

\(^2\) Though not exclusively, as there is also a significant research focus on mixed race in Brazil (see: Daniel 2006; Marx 1998; Nobles 2000), South Africa (see: Goldberg 1995; Marx 1998), and within Hispanophone Latin American nations (see: Anzaldúa 1987; Martinez-Echazabal 1998; Rodríguez 2000); among other nations across the globe to various degrees.
nations, the majority of historical mixed race research functioned to pathologise mixed race. This is particularly significant when contextualising the following, more contemporary celebratory accounts of mixedness that, in part, are in reaction to the negative portrayals of the past theorisation (Caballero 2004; Garner 2010; Ifekwunigwe 2004). Following the historical overview, I examine conceptualisations found in more current mixed race theory from both the United States and Britain. This examination will continue the contextualisation of my research and lead me to an overview of Critical Mixed Race Studies (CMRS). My focus on CMRS will begin to expose the current gaps in the still relatively young field of mixed race research, and will situate my research as a way to address some of the gaps.

**Mixed Race “Pathology”: Historical Mixed Race Theory**

European colonial projects in the New World helped foster the notion of “race,” which became a salient means to divide people through the “political and social interpretations of bodies and culture” (Garner 2010: 86). Indeed, the invention of “race,” through imperialism, is a fundamental part of modern, western society (McClintock 1995). Within this system of division, researchers assumed that it was not “natural” for people to “mix” among racialised lines, with the fear that it provided a threat to whiteness and white supremacy.

Writing on mixed race from before the twentieth century largely constructed mixed race as a “pathology.” People racialised as being mixed were often researched as objects of scrutiny (Ifekwunigwe 1999; Olumide 2002; Parker and Song 2001). This writing was largely concerned with individuals and their supposedly inherent biological or psychological “condition” that rendered them non- or less viable, physically or emotionally maladjusted, or otherwise inferior to “pure” White people (Bhattacharyya et al. 2002; Garner 2010; Jenkinson 2009; Small 1994b).

This pathology mentality was used to justify colonial projects, the trans-Atlantic slave trade, and racialised segregation—legally in the United States and socially in Britain. Evidence of this common aversion is exemplified in United States anti-miscegenation legislature, which remained in some parts of the country until as
recently as 1967. In addition to perceiving that racialised mixing was a threat to racial order, states believed that racialised mixing was a threat to notions of assumed racialised purity. It was thought that free contact between races would likely encourage racialised mixing; subsequently posing a challenge to “White prestige” and cause the deterioration of the White race (Furedi 2001; Ifekwunigwe 1999). The desire to protect the “white gene pool” led to the labelling of those racialised as mixed as “degenerate offspring” (Garner 2010: 74). This desire to exclude people racialised as mixed from racialised whiteness served to reinforce a binary between “White” and “non-White,” within the two nations. These presumptions of mixed race pathology further contributed to the view of mixed race inferiority. Social scientists in both the United States and Britain accepted ideas that interracial contact and mixing was “disruptive.” As a result, these beliefs biased their research on the children of such unions, who were relegated as “problem people” (Furedi 2001: 27). Researchers adopted the term “maladjusted,” based upon the notion of an individual struggling to adapt to change and to modernity. By focusing their thinking on assumed flaws in individuals, these thinkers avoided problematising imperialism and slavery, consistent with a pathology positioned within and in support of white hegemony.

Both Britain and the United States were important contexts for the development of “race science” during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Race science was premised on the assumption of racialised categorisation schemes that were seen as biological, discrete, and “pure.” These race theories were widely accepted as fact and as justification for colonialisation and enslavement (Ifekwunigwe 1999; Olumide 2002; Parker and Song 2001; Sexton 2008; Spencer 2010). As an example, when Europeans colonised parts of Africa, Asia, Australasia, and the Americas, they constructed the native people groups as “racial populations.” These newly racialised groups were viewed as being inferior in contrast to (often unacknowledged) racialised whiteness, and provides the basis for the particular racialisation processes in both Britain and the United States (Ifekwunigwe 1999; Olumide 2002; Sexton 2008; Smith 2012).
Biological race theories were one of the first “academic” attempts to quantify and qualify supposed biological characteristics and differences into racialised definitions and negative implications. At first, racialised signifiers focused on phenotypic markers that were given arbitrary meanings, such as cranium size, facial features, and skin tones; and peoples were generally divided into three to five racial groups (Garner 2010; Young 1995). Significantly, there was no agreement among race scientists as to how many racial groups there were. Racialised signifiers were given a positive or negative ranking, depending on to which group race scientists assigned them. This functioned to propagate ideas of White superiority and non-White inferiority (Eze 1997; Olumide 2002; Parker and Song 2001; Zack 1993).

At first, the designated differences were “linked” to inferiority based on subjective ideas of beauty and civility. Though later, phenotypic markers were also said to predict measures of intelligence and intelligence quotients (IQ) (Olumide 2002; Parker and Song 2001). These colonial attitudes persisted against racialised populations as White Europeans settled in some of the colonised nations (e.g., North America in the present-day United States) and contributed to the justification for the enslavement of racialised peoples during the trans-Atlantic slave trade (Banton 1998). Although widely discredited today in scholarly circles, biological race theories continue to leave a lasting legacy on the ways that other, “non-White” racialised groups are viewed in societies around the world (Bhattacharyya et al. 2002; HoSang et al. 2012; Parker and Song 2001).

Biological race science is a mostly historical scientific field that functioned to create and support notions of race, racial hierarchies, and racism. Ideas of race as a discrete, immutable, and intergenerationally stable biological category have been widely refuted by modern biological sciences; there is as much genetic and phenotypic variation within so-called “races” as between them (Ifekwunigwe 1999; Parker and Song 2001; Sims 2014; Zack 1993). Even though race science has a largely historical legacy, the cultural legacy of biological perspectives still persists in places. Most obviously, current “common-sense” notions of race tend to assume at least some validity of biological racialisation (Bullock 2010; Garner 2010; Glasgow 2009; Snipp 2002). An example of this, as argued by Jungmiwha Bullock,
is that persistent “slippages” of biological essentialism into racialised discourses at other levels of society remain commonplace. She examines references to particular ancestries as “bloodlines” when referring to racialised mixedness as examples of her argument, such as “Native American blood” or “Japanese blood” (Bullock 2010).

By the early twentieth century, the pathologisation of mixedness shifted from explicit race science to a constructed mixed race condition of “marginality.” Similar to race science, marginality narratives developed in both the United States and Britain. US sociologist Robert Park summarised marginality as the following:

Ordinarily the marginal man is a mixed blood, like the mulatto in the United States or the Eurasian in Asia, but that is apparently because the man of mixed blood is one who lives in two worlds, in both of which he is more or less a stranger.

Park 1928: 893.

Largely based on personal—opposed to empirical—observations, marginality assumed that mixed race individuals necessarily struggle to reconcile the races “within them.” (Christian 2000; Park 1928; Tizard and Phoenix 1993). Mixed race people, therefore, were constructed as socially alienated due to their “conflicting cultures” and “psychological malaise” (Christian 2000: 6, 7). Everett V. Stonequist (1937) also examined the supposed inherent difficulties of people racialised as mixed, as they navigated from one culture to another. After the publication, “marginal man” was commonly ascribed to anyone who was not easily identifiable into a specific racialised group or culture (Furedi 2001; Stonequist 1937; Young 1995).

This characterisation of mixed race was mirrored in Britain during the same period. Cecil Dover, more scathing than Robert Park, wrote that:

The ‘half-caste’ appears in a prodigal literature. It represents him, to be frank, most as an undersized, scheming and [as] entirely degenerate…. But more than all this, he is a potential menace to Western civilization, to everything that is White and majusculed. […] [A]ll hybrids are the work of the devil, that they inherit the vices of both
parents and the virtues of neither, they are without exception infertile, unbalanced, indolent, immoral and universally degenerate.

Dover 1937: 13, 279.

Dover viewed mixedness as entirely negative; positioning it as a threat to whiteness and western civilisation. Although Park did not go so far, and actually considered mixedness to be an embodiment of racial and social progress (Christian 2000; Park 1928), both constructions of marginality essentialise supposed racialised characteristics and assume that mixedness perpetuates the “worst” of each race.

The observations put forth regarding marginality from both nations can be read as an argument against racialised mixing, in that they proposed that individuals racialised as mixed will necessarily struggle with feeling trapped between two worlds. The theorised “inevitability of maladjustment” served as a warning against racialised mixing. Also stemming from this notion of the marginal man, anti-racism efforts by some in society at the time were looked upon as selfish and misguided attempts to cope with life (Furedi 2001). Stonequist argued that the marginal man was only motivated by his personal problems, and only for this reason he sought to change the implied “natural” patterns of race relations—that being the European as superior to the colonial (Furedi 2001; Stonequist 1937).

The United States and Britain share a similar development and history of racialised discourse, however there are also factors that are unique to each country that have shaped each distinctly from one another. The history of slavery, segregation, and anti-miscegenation legislature are key factors that greatly shaped racialised constructions in the United States (Bloch and Solomos 2010). Race in the United States is associated strongly with classification and categorisation status (Olumide 2002). Historically, racialised status was what determined freedom and enslavement, and is evidenced by the importance of racialised designations of “White” and “Black” from the first national census in 1790 (Gibson and Jung 2002). Additionally, race directly determined the legal rights of people during the enslavement era and afterwards during the Jim Crow and legalised segregation eras. Perhaps as a legacy of the heavy emphasis on race that has historically shaped social relations, presently, racialised designation in the United States draws
upon ancestry (e.g., hypodescent), as well as physical characteristics (Zack 1993). As a result, the strong Black/White binary concept of race exists and persists, often at the exclusion of other designated racialised groups in the USA, such as East/Southeast Asian, Native American, and Hispanic/Latino (Ifekwunigue 1999; Olumide 2002; Mahtani and Moreno 2001; Parker and Song 2001; Zack 1993). Specifically, in the case of US mixed race discourse, much of the theorising is informed by this context-specific history and geography of enslavement and the hypodescent classification schemes.

In contrast to the USA, Britain does not have the same racialised dynamics due to its own specific history and context. If the particular salience of race in the United States is around status rooted in enslavement and legalised segregation, Britain’s racial salience has developed from imperialism and immigration (Atkinson et al. 2015; Holmes 1991; Gilroy 1987/2002, Solomos and Back 1995). Due to the complex relationships that colonialism forced onto the “Commonwealth,” Britain began to receive an influx of economic migrants during the twentieth century. Particularly after the Second World War, immigrants—principally from the Asian subcontinent and the British Caribbean—increased dramatically, expanding the “visible minority” population within the United Kingdom (Bleich 2003; Freeman 1979; Layton-Henry 1992). Ira Katznelson outlines an important implication of the migration shifts:

> Concerns about absorbing racially or culturally different newcomers exposed an underlying tension throughout the postwar era between those who favored white immigrants of ‘good stock’ to the exclusion of ‘coloured’ immigrants, and those who felt a strong commitment to the multiracial Commonwealth.

Katznelson 1973: 127.

A significant amount of the British population expressed “immigration worries” that reflected racialised worries about the changing population of Britain. Not purely a worry about the quality of workers, Paul Gilroy and others have argued that non-immigrant populations viewed multiculturalism as a dilution of British heritage and a threat to British culture (Gilroy 1987/2002; Solomos and Back 1995). As immigration to Britain has continued from more nations and regions, similar worries have persisted within the British narrative as new populations establish and settle.
Examples of this are in the political discourses around the notion of “Britishness” that regained popularity during the late 1990s and early 2000s. The connotation of “Britishness” was not only used in reference to citizenship, but rather in describing cultural practices and values at best; and at times, alluding to whiteness and ancestral nativism (CRE 2005; Gamble and Wright 2009). This resulted in some racialised minorities feeling ostracised by the discourse, as they viewed the construct as exclusive of multiculturalism (CRE 2005). This example aligns with Gilroy’s summation that in terms of racialised dynamics, “…black and other minority settlers …constitute a problem…” for the British hegemonic culture (Gilroy 1987/2002: xii). Subsequently, due to the racialisation steeped in the historical legacies of imperialism and immigration, as well as continued discourses around inclusion and exclusion of national belonging, I agree with Erik Bleich, who argues that considerations of “race” in the British context cannot merely focus on phenotype. Considerations must also include the related issues of rights, citizenship, and policies towards immigrants and non-White minorities (Bleich 2003).

Similar to the United States, ideas of racialised designation in Britain incorporate elements of physical characteristics, but they differ as they also often rely on national ancestry and migration status (Olumide 2002). This reflects the racialisation of nationalism within British culture, which is not manifested in the same way in the USA (Bleich 2003; Ifekwunigwe 1999; Katznelson 1973; Kumar 2003). These differences factor into the racialised dynamics that are distinct for each country and provide the basis for examining racialised mixedness in both nations.

It is necessary to engage with the colonial and global migration histories of the United States and Britain in order to better understand race and racialisation today. The histories of how different people groups met, mixed, and became racialised help to construct and shape notions of personal and collective identity. Considering this historical framework is important, as it contextualises beliefs of mixed race that have emerged and influenced racialised paradigms in Britain and the United States. As I have argued, Britain and the United States have comparable, though distinct,
racialised histories. They share a common basis for an assumed Black/White racialised binary through histories of race science and assumptions of mixed race marginality (Bhattacharyya et al. 2002; Small 1994a, 1994b). Although these paradigms run parallel to each other, the operationalisation of racialised dynamics are distinctive for Britain and the United States. Both nations have colonial histories, though Britain’s is an example of an imperial power that had large global reach and the US is an example of settler colonialism (Bloch and Solomos 2010; HoSang and LaBennett 2012; Small 1994a; Smith 2012). Both have parallel trans-Atlantic enslavement histories. However, the direct interactions of the slave trade and slave ownership within the United States shaped racialised relationships distinctly from British interactions, as slave trading and ownership primarily happened from afar, in the latter case (Small 1994a, 1994b). Significantly, in both nations, much of the racialised mixture as a result of colonial encounters did not happen under benign circumstances. Populations racialised as “mixed” have emerged commonly through “deeply felt historical violations of imperial sexual conquest and enslavement” (Parker and Song 2001: 13). The power relations embedded within these circumstances along colonial and gender lines have contributed to negative attitudes of mixedness in the past.

Specific socio-historical contexts are important to consider when widening racialisation theorisation to more than one nation. Theories themselves are not necessarily contextually specific, but they will also be informed by the histories and social situations within each nation.

Celebration, Response, and Radical: Current Mixed Race Theorisation

After considering the historical attitudes towards mixed race in the previous section, I now turn to contemporary research in the next two sections.

The current research in the United States and Britain seeks to turn away from the past views of inherent inferiority and pathology. In contrast, a more contemporary reaction against this trajectory can be seen in the largely positive and celebratory types of constructions of mixed race. Since the early contemporary work from the
1980s and 1990s, there have been various theories developed to acknowledge, define, and qualify descriptions and constructions of mixed race vis-à-vis racial categorisation structures and existing racial orders. Below, I will review some of the prominent themes from the early contemporary mixed race literature.

In the early mixed race theorisation, the primary and foundational discursive debate concerned arguments for the acknowledgement of people who have more than one racialised background and the social consequences of having this racialised status (Root 1992, 1996a, 1996b). As such, it was argued that race is a social construction with social consequences, particularly for minority-racialised groups. Consequently, a reason to use racialised terminology such as “mixed race” has been justified because of the possibility that racialised identity “can be an important mobilizing force for those struggling against discrimination and disadvantage” (Parker and Song 2001: 5). Those in Britain and the United States identifying themselves as mixed race are beginning to come together as a collective identity for the purposes of mobilising themselves in ways comparable to other racialised minorities in their respective societies.

Until recently, general sociological analyses on racialisation has largely overlooked the category of mixed race. Instead, there has been an almost exclusive focus on racialised groups that have been constructed as singular in nature. This inattention is in spite of the recent articulations and constructions of mixed race focusing outside of racialised processes. Constructions of mixedness have been positioned in newer discourses as an attempt to challenge the assumption of racialised ontology based in notions of clear and pure racialised categories (Ifekwunigwe 1999; Olumide 2002; Parker and Song 2001; Zack 1999). Only since the 1990s, there has been an increased acknowledgement of mixed race by writers and researchers; mostly those who consider themselves mixed race and/or are the parents of mixed race children.

Frequently, early mixed race theorisation promoted the acknowledgement of mixed race as a racialised category in both Britain and the United States (e.g., for Britain,
see: Alibhai-Brown 2001; Olumide 2002; Parker and Song 2001; Phoenix and Owen 1996; Tizard and Phoenix 1993 and for US, see: Herschel 1996; Root 1992, 1995, 1996a; Williams-León and Nakashima 2001). Even as theory and research have developed beyond or away from this premise, the majority remains based in this early work as an important reference point (Daniel et al. 2014; Mahtani 2014; Spencer 2011). Early arguments suggested that the prevalence of mixed race pointed to a positive shift in racialised relations (Root 1996b). Mixed race has also been proposed as a vehicle to challenge racialised understandings and to act as bridges for healing racialised divisions (Anzaldúa 1987; Root 1992, 1996a, 1996b; critiqued by Nakashima 1996; Spencer 1999, 2004, 2011; Williams-León and Nakashima 2001). Scholars such as Maria P. P. Root and Naomi Zack were among the first to collate early contemporary mixed race theorisation into anthologies exploring mixed race identity and socialisation. Accordingly, they are often cited as key foundational theorists on mixed race scholarship, across numerous national contexts of work.

The edited volumes by Naomi Zack (1995a) and Maria P. P. Root (1992; 1996a) began to explore what the early scholars saw as the diverse mixed race experience, positioned primarily in the United States. As they are cited to be among the first volumes to focus specifically on mixed race, they have also provided the groundwork for mixed race scholarship outside of the United States. Collectively, these bodies of work began to move away from the Black/White binary dominant in previous race and race relations research. Root conceptualises “mixed race” as inclusive of anyone with more than one racialised background. She argues for the importance of a mixed race category from her findings of similar experiences of mixedness among those described as such, but stops she short of equating such a category with a new “cultural group” (Root 1992, 1996b). More specifically, Jill Olumide theorised on what she termed the “mixed race condition,” which features her observations of common patterns in the socialisation among diverse groups of mixed race individuals, such as around identity development, belonging, and struggles with emotions (Olumide 2002). Through these and other works positing a commonality among mixed race experience (e.g., Alibhai-Brown 2001; Nakashima
“mixed race” has become commonly understood and accepted as a term since the 1990s in both Britain and the United States (Ali 2003; Parker and Song 2001).

The use of personal narrative in contemporary studies centred individuals as subjects, in contrast to the objectifying pathological writings from the past (Ifekwunigwe 2004; Mahtani 2014; Parker and Song 2001). This has allowed for mixed race study to broaden from the primary Black/White focus of race science and marginality to bodies of research that focus on “mixed race” with no overtly imposed constructions of racialised mixedness (Aspinall and Song 2013; Brunsma 2006; Edwards et al. 2012; Ifekwunigwe 2004; King-O’Riain et al. 2014; Parker and Song 2001; Winters and Debose 2003), or focus on specific racialised mixedness outside of the Black/White binary (Fulbeck 2010; Murphy-Shigematsu 2012; Williams-León and Nakashima 2001). Evidence of the legacy of a Black/White binary can be seen in the early work of the US American philosopher, Naomi Zack. In acknowledged contrast to many of her contemporaries, Zack argues against the viability of mixedness as a category and builds a “post-race” theory of “racelessness” and “deracination” (Zack 1992, 1993, 1995b). In describing her position, she writes:

The concept of race is an oppressive cultural invention and convention, and I refuse to have anything to do with it.... Therefore I have no racial affiliation and will accept no racial designations. If more people joined me in refusing to play the unfair game of race, fewer injustices based on the concept of race would be perpetrated.


Her key text Race and Mixed Race (1993), which focuses on Black and White classifications in the United States, further contextualises the quote above. Zack posits that people racialised as mixed (meaning specifically of Black and White ancestry) cannot be classified as mixed race in the third-person, and therefore cannot have self-determined first-person mixed race identities (Zack 1993). She does not accept that people of mixed race will be identified as such, and therefore rejects the idea of self-identified mixedness. Zack positions her argument within the assumption of an historical hypodescent Black/White binary rooted in the socio-historical context of the United States and remained prevalent during the time
of her writing. In her claim, Zack fails to consider the many factors that influence personal and collective identities, not to mention the shifting nature of racialisation. Instead, she explores a model that relies solely on external perceptions of race at the expense of personal agency. There is no acknowledgement of the varied and personal ways in which people can forge their own mixed race identities.

There was also an increasing movement towards proclaiming and accepting “mixed race” identities at the time of this early scholarship. This was especially true in the United States, which lies in tension with Zack’s original position. In the development of her mixed race identity theory, she draws on the US-specific context of Black slavery ownership and kinship-informed identity. Zack argues that for people racialised as mixed, there is an issue of “contradictory identities” because they have to identify with both a slave- and a slave-owner history (Zack 1995b). The mixed race theory Zack develops is not one that can easily be applied across national contexts. Even if it were confined to the United States social context, Zack again overlooks personal agency by not allowing for individual history and fluidity in the development of mixed race identity. Her theory assumes Black slave ancestry and White slave-ownership ancestry, which is not true for all people in the United States, let alone elsewhere. There is a need for the development of mixed race theory—as part of racialisation theories—to move beyond assumptive narrow constructions of race and nation-specific generalities. This would open up theorisation to more encompassing frameworks that allow for broader constructions of mixedness within national contexts. Additionally, this would acknowledge different racialisation processes occurring in other national contexts, which are comparably important to the larger field of (mixed) race studies.

Particular to the United States context, some theorists have rejected the term “mixed race” for “multiracial”—a relatively novel way to talk about and conceptualise mixedness; further removed from the negative associations from the past (Mahtani and Moreno 2001; Parker 2004; Parker and Song 2001; Root 1992, 1996a). The term “multiracial” employs the use of the “multi-” prefix in an attempt to move beyond the Black/White binary, and is argued to connote a broader notion
of racialised ancestry (Parker and Song 2001; Root 1996b). It has been argued that the term “mixed race” implies racialised purity that is tainted by the mixture it describes (Mahtani and Moreno 2001; Parker and Song 2001; S. Spencer 2014). “Multiracial” purportedly departs from that, as it is said to acknowledge diversity in a neutral, non-hierarchical way. I am not persuaded by this argument; as long as the term “race” is invoked as a meaningful descriptor, the modifier does little to negate the premise of the history of the term. As has been argued more recently, “multi-” is not so different from the connotation of “mixed-” (S. Spencer 2014). Both terms rely on the “combination” of more than one essentialised notion of race and therefore can still uphold the assumptions of racialised purity. I am not convinced that “multi-” achieves the neutrality and removes the implications of racialised purity that proponents of multiracial discourse attempt to reject.

Mixed race studies from the 1990s and early 2000s provided an important groundwork for contemporary explorations of mixed race in the United States and Britain. As the field continues to mature, hindsight provides opportunities to revisit and build upon theorisation (Daniel et al. 2014). I now turn to more current contemporary theorisation, which casts a critical eye on the past whilst continuing to move forward in the development of mixed race studies.

**Critical Mixed Race Studies**

A growing group of scholars under the umbrella term of Critical Mixed Race Studies has begun to revisit early contemporary scholarship through a race critical lens. One of the goals of CMRS is to attempt to challenge previous assumptions and further expand upon mixed race knowledge (Carter 2013; Elam 2011; King-O’Riain et al. 2014; Daniel et al. 2014; Mahtani 2014; McNeil 2010; Sexton 2008; R. Spencer 2011, 2014). For these scholars, the contemporary rise in mixed race theories that focus on identity and experience potentially lack race criticality; and whether intentionally or not, can end up perpetuating false narratives about mixedness.

A frequent point of criticism for the growing number of CMRS scholars, unsurprisingly, is the lack of criticality in the majority of popular media, as well as
within a sizeable portion of academic scholarship on the topic (Brunsma 2006; Daniel et al. 2014; Mahtani 2014; Rockquemore et al. 2009; R. Spencer 1999, 2004, 2011, 2014). David Brunsma’s argument summarises a key problem with the large body of descriptive work:

The trajectory of multiracial research desperately needs to be self-critical, to be willing to adopt new lenses with which to view the phenomena at hand; in sum, the field of multiracial identity is at a place where those investigating such processes must begin to answer the classic question, so what?

Brunsma 2006: 5.

The issue of “So what?” is the key question through which critical mixed race research can be used to address racialised paradigms, discourses, and processes that the mere existence of “mixed race” erroneously claims to challenge and transcend. Minelle Mahtani argues that the primary focus on “present-day temporality” is a problematic focus that perhaps is rooted into common methodologies within mixed race research. She and others have suggested that centring the focus on subjects who self-identify as mixed race and speak about their personal lived experiences in unstructured interviews shifts epistemological focus away from more encompassing socio-historical and geopolitical contextualisation (Mahtani 2012; Rockquemore et al. 2009). As Minkah Makalani suggests that:

…singular focus on personal experience...blur[s] the line between group historical experience and personal experience…mak[ing] the structural character of racism an ancillary concern.

Makalani 2001: 84

In mixed race research, the predominant focus on personal lived experience has the effect of overlooking and obscuring structural and institutional racisms. There is a limit to what these types of personal narratives can accomplish on their own when remaining disconnected from collective struggles (Mahtani 2014). Furthermore, the uncritical acceptance of the narratives that focus on uncontextualised personal lived experience functions to conflate “identity” with “race” (Makalani 2001). Mahtani argues, therefore, that CMRS must do more to contextualise racialised mixedness through engaging with the socio-historical and geopolitical contexts that lead to
racialised mixedness instead of continuing to romanticise colonial histories through continued uncriticality (Mahtani 2014).

Another common criticism that arises in CMRS is the frequent ahistoricity of contemporary accounts of racialised mixedness. Habiba Ibrahim argues that it is a symptom of the following:

- Mixed racialism is in resounding want of a history—and a redress to injury—at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Contemporary imaginations of racialised mixedness are frequently disjointed from the history that precedes it by hundreds of years. Related to present-day imaginations, the lack of a socio-historical and geopolitical contextualisation as a result of reimagining mixed race to be a new phenomenon due to a twentieth century “mixed race baby boom” further functions to remove the structural influences over time and place (Ibrahim 2007; Rockquemore 1998; Spencer 1999, 2011). Kerry Ann Rockquemore rejects the notion that racialised mixing is a “newly emergent social phenomenon,” explaining that “[t]he Census is merely the latest manifestation of the ongoing socio-historical problematic of classifying mixed-race people” (Rockquemore 1998: 197-198). Mahtani calls this a “strategic forgetting” of racialised histories (Mahtani 2014). She further elaborates that “multiracial amnesia” erases the histories of “parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents” through analyses that privilege personal narrative (Mahtani 2014: 46). Rainier Spencer further illustrates his frustration with ahistorical claims of mixed race newness by readopting the term “mulatto” in place of neologisms for racialised mixedness. His aim is “to bring ['mulatto'] out of the state of historical suspended animation it has been in” since the rise of “Generation Mix” (Spencer 2011: 1).

An important ontological concern for CMRS scholars is: who exactly is (or is not) mixed race? In their monograph from the inaugural Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies journal, G. Reginald Daniel, Laura Kina, Wei Ming Dariotis, and Camilla Fojas explored the issue of “mixed race” being commonly imagined as an individual
with two differently racialised parents.

Indeed, given that humans first evolved in eastern Africa millennia ago, everyone...is in some sense an African-descent...quite apart from those individuals who are also descendants of the West African Diaspora associated with the Atlantic slave trade from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. [...] [T]he field...brings into sharp focus the extensive “racial blending” that has characterized human history from time immemorial but that has been ignored, obscured, and erased by several hundred years of Eurocentric thought supporting notions of racial (and cultural) purity.


They bring to the fore the inherent problem with the logic of racialisation. There are no pure races, as “races” have mixed throughout human history. As such, this raises the question of whether the notion of “mixed race” is actually a viable category. Ultimately, they argue that the social implications of racialisation do make it a compelling site onto which to analyse racialisation processes and experiences. Though, this need not occur though a continued obscuring of racialised histories throughout the world.

Turning specifically to mixed racialisation, Rainier Spencer raises the issue of the issue of “multigenerational” mixedness in mixed race studies. Arguing from the US context, Spencer contends that there is an inherent illogicality in the ways that specifically “Black/White biracials” are somehow “different” from Black American populations, which through the history of US enslavement often have a mixture of racialised ancestry (Spencer 1999, 2004, 2011). He asks whether the children of parents from two differently racialised backgrounds are biologically distinct from children from two Black American parents (Spencer 2004). Spencer argues that there is not (as there is no biological race), and then turns to social identities. Remaining unsatisfied, he writes:

[We are dealing with a zero sum game of who is and who is not mixed racially. Every attempt by black/white multiracials to set themselves at a distance from the always already-mixed American mulatto population that they are an indistinguishable part of represents an artificial and arbitrary (one might even say unnatural) fracturing of the American mulatto reality.

Spencer 2011: 139.
Spencer argues that there is no meaningful point at which to distinguish individuals with historical racialised mixture and individuals with recent racialised mixture. Furthering this line of thinking, if two individuals with recent racialised mixture had children, would the children be welcomed into “Generation Mix”? Although his research specifically addresses Black/White racialised mixture in the United States, the ideas can be extended to other racialised mixtures and outside of the United States, as there is an inherent illogicality to the distinguishing of “mixed race” from “single race,” when “races” have been mixing for millennia throughout the world.

Daniel, Kina, Dariotis, and Fojas have a slightly different take on the matter of “multigenerational multiraciality.” They admit that within mixed race studies, there is an at times uncritical contrast between “the historical ‘multigenerational multiraciality’ that was a corollary to Western European colonial expansion” and so-called “‘first-generation’ experiences of individuals who compose the ‘biracial baby boom’” that is underscored by assertions that the latter is often seen as a “more legitimate” mixed race identity (Daniel et al. 2014: 18). They view this perspective as a myopic ignorance to the struggles of previous generations, but then fall into uncritical territory by their explanation that these previous generations “struggled, and continue to struggle, to liberate their identities from hypodescent and monoracial norms” (Daniel et al. 2014: 19). Although this may be the experience of some, the framing of the struggles as “liberation” assumes that the present project of mixed race identity can (and should) be transposed onto the past, and fails to acknowledge and consider perspectives where mixed race identity is not a goal.

Some CMRS scholars have critiqued mixed race ideology as being “anti-Black” (Gordon 1995, 1997; Jones 1994; Sexton 2008; Spencer 2004, 2011). This perspective is based within a Black/White binary understanding of racialisation and racism that places the former at the bottom of a racialised hierarchy and the latter at the top. Lewis Gordon argues that mixed race studies have largely ignored anti-Blackness through reluctance or refusal to engage with it (Gordon 1997). Rainier Spencer agrees, asserting that “multiracial ideology is far more
complicit...than it is subversive of current deployments of race” (Spencer 2011: 227). Habiba Ibrahim suggests that this is done through common mixed race discourses that “tacitly [situate] blackness as outmoded and multiracial as emergent” (Ibrahim 2012: vii). Gordon, Spencer, and others claim that asserting racialised mixedness is an attempt to dilute or deny Blackness and seek White privilege (Gordon 1997; Jones 1994; Parker and Song 2001; Sexton 2008; Spencer 2004, 2011). They frame their arguments through the lens of deep, historical Black/White antagonism. This is an important argument about the potential implications of mixed race theory that needs further attention. At the same time, however, it tacitly disregards the wider theorisation on mixedness that includes racialised mixedness that does not include Black backgrounds and racialised backgrounds that include neither racialised Blackness nor Whiteness. Perhaps a more critical take on this issue would include investigating the thoughts and motivations of those who are not “Black/White biracial” in their understandings and perspectives of racialised placement within an assumed Black/White racial hierarchy.

The review of mixed race literature offers an important contextualisation for my research. It is important to consider the history of mixed race scholarship—from pathology to celebration to critique—to understand the positioning of my research. In line with CMRS scholars, my research aims to interrogate the concept of mixed race by exploring an answer to David Brunsma’s question of “so what?” (2006). In light of the canon of mixed race literature, I find there are many unresolved and unresearched questions about the more structural influences on mixed race construction. The micro-levels of individual identity and experience have dominated the mixed race literature, at the expense of investigating the levels of collectivities and their influence in contemporary mixed race discourses. In order to shift focus to group and institutional levels of mixed race construction, I turn to the investigation of racialisation processes through racial formation theory, as a theoretical framework through which to investigate the roles of higher-level social systems in the creation of mixed race.
RACIAL FORMATION THEORY

Racial Formation Theory Overview

To study race...is to enter a world of paradox, irony, and danger. In this world, arbitrarily chosen human attributes shape policy, love and hate, life and death. All the powers of the intellect—artistic, religious, scientific, political—are pressed into service to explain racial distinctions, and to suggest how they may be maintained, changed, or abolished.

Omi and Winant 1986: xiii.

Most scholarly fields accept that race is a social construction (Omi and Winant 2015). The above review of the ways that mixed race has been imagined and constructed illustrates not only the socially constructed nature of race, but the contextual influences of racialised meanings over time and place. However, as discussed above, despite the wide acknowledgement of the social, political, and historical origins of race, there is little research focused on mixed race that explores the substance of the contextual racialisation of mixedness. Instead, research frequently examines mixed race as a category with assumed, universal (or widely understood) meanings. The result is that mixed race is described in ways that essentialise identity and experiences through generalisations based on assumed commonalities, which in turn reify mixed race. There have been few critical interrogations of the concept itself—the logics, constructions, and discursive practices that go into creating the category in a given time and place. This is a significant gap that I will begin to address in the thesis.

According to the theory developed by US sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant, “racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed” over time and space by a combination of social, historical, and political processes (Omi and Winant 1994: 55, 2002: 124). Racial formation theory provides a useful framework through which to investigate the particulars of racialisation processes that “locate the role of race in structuring broader social formations” (HoSang and LaBennett 2012: 5). Omi and Winant view race as a social construct, though not one that is merely an “ideological illusion” that influences other forms of social stratification. Race has a long, salient, and pervasive history that is significant to all
social relations (HoSang and LaBennett 2012). At the same time, race is viewed as socially and politically transient; the meanings and logistics of which are never fully fixed. Rather, race is seen as an “unstable and ‘decentered’ complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle” (Omi and Winant 1994: 55). Ultimately, Omi and Winant view race as a key category of social differentiation and stratification, and a shifting concept that warrants investigation and understanding (Omi and Winant 2015). Through this perspective, racial formation theory has been used greatly in scholarship to examine the ever-shifting ways that race is conceptualised and created in a variety of social settings (HoSang et al. 2012).

In racial formation theory, race is understood to be a socio-historically constructed concept that has real implications in social relations.

Our theory of racial formation emphasizes the social nature of race, the absence of any essential racial characteristics, the historical flexibility of racial meanings and categories, the conflictual character of race at both the “micro-” and “macro-social” levels, and the irreducible political aspect of racial dynamics.

Omi and Winant 1986: 4, emphasis in original.

Within this theoretical framework, race is positioned as something that shifts and changes meaning over time and across societies. In racial formation theory, one of the most significant ways through which this happens is the many socio-political interactions within societies at state, institutional, community, and individual levels. The interactions among these different social levels cause the contestation and (re)articulation of race that propels the trajectory of race and racial meanings.

For racial formation theory, the concept of race—in a given socio-historical context and used for racial categorisation—is understood to be constructed through both structural and cultural elements within societies. Structural elements include the ways in which race features in laws, policies, and other types of legislative and political practices and thought. In other words, it can be thought to be “institutional” in quality. Cultural elements can be understood as the types of racial interactions and articulation that happen in the “everyday” interactions among individuals and small groups of people (Essed 1991, 2001; Omi and Winant 1994).
By acknowledging both of these elements in racial formation, there is room for smaller-scale—and even personal—experiences to be taken into account when examining how race functions, effects, and shapes societies alongside the larger and perhaps more widely acknowledgeable structural elements that shape racial perceptions.

_Ethnicity, Class, and Nationality_

Omi and Winant developed the theory in part as a response to prevailing research in the late 1970s and early 1980s that examined the concept of race through the lenses of other social phenomena, i.e., ethnicity, class, and nationality (Omi and Winant 1986, 1994, 2012, 2015). Omi and Winant critiqued these theories as forms of “reductionism” that placed racial phenomena as effects of supposedly more significant social concepts (Omi and Winant 1994).

Ethnicity theories are those that comprised the early challenges to the pre-1940s biological paradigms. According to Omi and Winant, ethnicity theories reimagined race primarily as “culture”—flexible attributes such as religion, language, lifestyle, cuisine. Consequentially, racialised status was viewed not as ascribed or imposed, but as voluntary and variable (Omi and Winant 2015). For Omi and Winant, the most significant failure of ethnicity theories is that they downplay the importance of corporeal, phenotypic markers as signifiers for racialisation. As a result, race imagined as ethnicity ignores the stigma, exclusion, privilege, and violence that they argue is “inherent in ‘the mark of race,’ the phenomic ‘ocular’ dimension of racial belonging” (Omi and Winant 2015: 40).

As a critical response to ethnicity approaches to race, nationality theories are rooted in the legacies and dynamics of colonialism. As such, race and racialisation are seen as colonial outcomes that are based on global and epochal relationships (Omi and Winant 1994). For Omi and Winant, the connection between nation and racialised dynamics is tenuous. Although nationality theories “imagine communities” (Anderson 1991) through collective identity and traditions, the idea of “peoplehood” cannot fully grasp the phenomenon of race in a comprehensive way.
Although nationality approaches can examine a “peoplehood,” Omi and Winant suggest that “the very inability of the nation-based account to specify precisely what exactly is ‘national’ about racial oppression...leads it to lend a certain primacy and integrity to racial phenomenon” (Omi and Winant: 2015: 96).

Broadly, class theories are those that argue that “social divisions which assume a distinctively racial or ethnic character can be attributed or explained principally by reference to economic structures and processes (Hall 1980: 306; Omi and Winant 2015: 53). They privilege understandings of racialisation as occurring through economic relationships, market exchange, distribution, and production. Racialised inequality is effectively reduced to a class system. Although they value contributions from class perspectives, Omi and Winant argue that class perspectives limit understanding of race and racialisation processes to a secondary aspect of social inequality (Omi and Winant 2015).

Racial formation theory prioritises race as a social phenomenon that is developed and contested throughout social life, which is not an “irreducible component of collective identities and social structures” (Omi and Winant 1994: 138). According to them, the original context in which racial formation theory was conceptualised has changed over the years, the notion that race is not fixed, but has fluidity of meaning is more commonplace (Omi and Winant 2015). Nevertheless, racial formation theory still offers an alternative to approaches that understand race through lenses of culture, class, or colonial encounters.

**Racial Projects**

Racial formation is performed through a variety of institutions called “racial projects” that occur in all aspects of society. According to Omi and Winant, race is neither a mere concept nor idea, neither solely a representation nor signification. It cannot be observed or discussed without referring it to social structure (Omi and Winant 2015). Race is not imagined as static in this theoretical framework. Both structural and cultural elements of racialised interactions are continually rearticulated, developed, and changed in a given society. Race is a fluid concept that is being
formed—shaped and reshaped by historical, social, and political issues across time and space. Subsequently, racial projects are conceptualised as “simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial identities and meanings, and an effort to organize and distribute resources (economic, political, cultural) along particular racial lines” (Omi and Winant 2015: 125, emphasis in original). Racial projects provide a link between racialised social structure and racialised discursive practice in the analysis of racial formation (Omi and Winant 2015; Thompson 2012; Winant 2001). They can be analysed as they emerge in different socio-historical contexts and interactions (Winant 2001). A unique element of the theory is that it focuses particularly on how state institutions and social movements contribute to notions of race. While acknowledging other forms of social stratification (e.g., gender, class, nationality), race is prioritised as an important part of contemporary social divisions that must continue to be examined as a viable social category.

In order to discuss racial projects in more depth, Omi and Winant introduce two levels of racial projects: the macro-level and the micro-level (Omi and Winant 1986, 1994, 2015). For Omi and Winant, macro-level racial projects are those which occur at structural and institutional levels within the public domain. These racial projects focus on the racial elements of large-scale institutions, such as within policy debates and other state activities (Omi and Winant 1994). On the other end, micro-level social projects are those that occur at cultural, interpersonal levels of interaction. Despite these differences in focus, both levels of racial projects link the practice of signification and the structuring of inequality.

**Critical Responses to Racial Formation Theory**

Racial formation theory emerged in the 1980s primarily to offer a contrast to the biological notions of race prevalent before the 1940s. As noted above, it was also developed to counter theories that emerged in the latter portion of the twentieth century that framed race as a result of ethnicity, class, or nationality dynamics (Omi and Winant 2015). In elaborating on the social construction of race, Omi and Winant highlight the varied and shifting racialised concepts that change over time and differ in accordance with the socio-historical condition in which it is situated.
However, they acknowledge that this position begs follow-up questions about exactly how race is constructed, why racialised meanings change over time and space, and the role of race within a given social system (Omi and Winant 2015). Because of this ambiguity within the social constructionist paradigm, there has been some criticism around the ways that racial formation is conceptualised.

Robert Miles’ perspective summarises the main critique, as he argues:

[T]he use of the word “race” to label the groups so distinguished by such features is an aspect of the social construction of reality: ‘races’ are socially imagined rather than biological realities.

Miles 1989: 71.

Miles believes that using “race” as a meaningful concept acts to reify race. He argues that race is merely an ideological construct, and therefore by ceasing to use the word, race will no longer be reproduced (Miles 1989). However, this position denies the social implications of race. Though race does not have any biological reality to it, it is not merely theoretical or imagined to those who experience the negative effects of racialisation (Small 1994a; Bhattacharyya et al. 2002). It also denies the analytical value of the concept of race. The significance of racialisation is likely to be obscured by refraining from identify it.

A further argument levied against racial formation theory is that race is reified within the framework of the approach. This relates to the larger vein of argument that criticises race scholars for their acknowledgement of and referral to race as leading to the reification of race in itself. This issue is commonly addressed to scholars doing empirical work on race, as it is difficult—if not impossible—to study the phenomena of racialised social construction and their real social effects and consequences without using racial terminology (Ali 2003; Brubaker 2004; DaCosta 2007). I disagree, however, with the idea that racial formation theory necessarily reifies race within its framework. Racial formation theory rejects the idea of fixed and essentialised notions of race, and examines race as a constructive process which is shaped and shifted by structural and cultural racial projects. Rogers Brubaker argues that a general problem with scholarship on race, ethnicity, and
nation is that they are often conceptualised as too substantive; as entities or collectives that are too tangible or concrete. Instead, they should be thought of:

...in terms of practical categories, situated actions, cultural idioms, cognitive schemas, discursive frames, organizational routines, institutional forms, political projects, and contingent events. It means thinking of ethnicization, racialization, and nationalization as political, social, cultural and psychological processes. And it means taking as a basic analytical category not the “group” as an entity, but groupness as a contextually fluctuating conceptual variable.

Brubaker 2004: 11.

Racial formation theory was developed in order to accommodate for this positioning in the investigation of racialisation processes and race constructions. From this perspective, race (as with other types of social distinctions, to which the argument of Brubaker can also be applied) can be a primary focus of inquiry without reifying it. It is important, however, to use racial formation theory as an intentional method for analysing racialisation processes without falling back onto uncritical assumptions about race, which is perhaps what the criticism is attempting to address.

Another potential limitation of racial formation theory is that the application of the theory often inadvertently embodies the specific racial context of the United States, which—as any other social, historical, or political social context—is unique to the nation (despite connections and points of comparability with other contexts). Whilst this is not something that limits the theory in a general sense, the lack of acknowledgement of the positioning of the original theory in the US racial context can become problematic when unthoughtfully applied to other specific national contexts. For example, in the justification for their approach, Omi and Winant cite the prevalence of class explanations relating to ethnicity and nation when analysing specific issues around race. In particular, they criticised how race is relegated as an epiphenomenon of other forms of social division and is not prioritised as a socially meaningful entity itself (Omi and Winant 1986, 1994). As evidenced by the way race has been tied to citizenship, human rights, and even full personhood over US history, this criticism is an important one to consider. By contrast, in Britain, class, ethnicity, and nation are differently salient elements of social division. This may
require a different focus (alongside race) in developing theory because of social-historical differences between the two societies. There are many reasons for this divergence; of great distinction is the relative racial focus in law and governance in the US since the founding of the nation. This includes the social and structural legacies of mainland slavery and legalised racial segregation that have influenced the interactions of racialised groups and continue to do so. This is not to say that other forms of social division do not factor into racial (or other) dynamics in the United States. For similar reasons, theories developed in European contexts around class, ethnicity, and nation also did not neatly fit for the United States racial context. This prompted the original critique that lead to the development of racial formation theory (Omi and Winant 1986, 1994).

Along this same line of criticism are specific critiques that race inquiry and research in Britain has become “Americanised.” These critiques posit that a solitary or primary focus on skin colour paradigms reduce or negate the European explanations of nation and immigration that also influence notions of race in Great Britain (Olumide 2002; Popoviciu and Mac an Ghaill 2004). The result of this suggested shift “beyond the modernist black-white dualistic model serves to critique the long academic tradition of ‘over-racializing’ selected groups of ‘non-whites,’ while deracialising the Anglo-ethnic majority and white minorities” (Popoviciu and Mac an Ghaill 2004: 99). This critique instead calls for theoretical work to focus on broader notions of difference that move beyond a simplistic White and Black dualism. The dualism, as often applied in the United States (Popoviciu and Mac an Ghaill 2004; Root 1992, 1996b), does not fit the British context due, in part, to White ethnic groups from the Old Commonwealth nations and the European Union that have a significant migrant history in the United Kingdom, in addition to other non-White ethnic groups from the New Commonwealth nations and beyond that have also settled in the UK over time. The ways in which these racialised minorities are viewed in Britain, as the ways in which they become racialised, follows a different trajectory with different social outcomes from that in the United States and elsewhere (Banton 1998; Popoviciu and Mac an Ghaill 2004). The result of not acknowledging this social history is “an overemphasis” of racial formation
processes around the issue of skin colour, thus amalgamating diverse people
groups by hue, as was done in the United States via slavery, the census, and the
allocation of human rights. This process may then also work to negate ethnic,
national, and immigration differences among groups under the false assumptions of
the US context. This also normalises White ethnic groups to a singular racial
majority that ceases to be acknowledged as a social group comparable to the
constructed others.

Despite these limitations, racial formation theory is still a useful tool to examine race
and racialisation processes in national contexts outside of the United States.
Although developed in the United States, the approach can be used without
applying US-specific racialisation processes to outside contexts. I am informing my
use of racial formation theory with an explicit acknowledgement that “the
relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and
subject formations” (McCall 2005: 1771) are present within racialisation processes
in a given social context. Indeed, Omi and Winant acknowledge that despite their
prioritisation of race, race is but one of the several “modalities of power”—alongside
class, gender, sexual orientation, and others—that shape social realties (Omi and
Winant 1994: 68, 2015). Practically, in the study of social differences and
inequalities, the idea that multiple social forces interact with each other suggests
that the elements that contribute to such differences and inequalities are
interrelated and jointly influenced by the different systems of society (Collins 2000).
With this in mind, it remains useful to focus on one modality of power, in order to
understand its particular role in social processes.

**Racial Formation Theory in My Approach**
My research will use racial formation theory to examine specifically how mixed race
has been constructed since the 1990s to present. The research will focus on the

---

3 Only people racialised as White were counted as full human beings in the early US censuses. Not
only was that group the only one afforded rights as US citizens, but also to be afforded mere
acknowledgement as human beings and as full members of the US population. In accordance to the
Three-Fifths Compromise of 1787, some Native Americans were not counted on the census and
Black slaves were counted as only three-fifths of a person (Alexander 2012).
trajectories of race in two nations: the US and Britain. In particular, I am interested in focusing on the role of bodies with influence and power, as they have been important factors in the rise of the “Mixed Race Baby Boom” discourses. The two particularly salient bodies that act as racial projects in creating these discourses are that of the national census and mixed race organisations. The census is a state institution that plays an important role in ascribing racialised identity onto individuals through categorisation, and in 2000 (US) and 2001 (GB), determined how the state would officially recognise mixedness. Mixed race organisations are groups that form collectivities around racialised identities, which function to build and reinforce constructions of mixedness.

At present, even though racial formation is an often-cited theory for race research, it has rarely been used as a primary and systematic theoretical framework in research in mixed race studies. An exception to this is Chamion Caballero’s research that drew upon the concept of racial projects to explore “mixed race projects” in the United Kingdom and the United States (Caballero 2004). She examined the trajectories of mixed race and identified a parallel move from historical pathology to a contemporary focus on individual rights, and identified “projects” around personal, institutional, and racially political debates in both nations. Nevertheless, racial formation theory has yet to be used systematically to examine the discursive and constructive practices of mixed race within the specific contexts of the state and mixed race organisations.

The exclusive focus of Omi and Winant on macro-level and micro-level racial projects in their articulation of racial projects and racial formation theory leads to a problematic binary. Whilst some aspects of society—such as the state or an individual—fit well enough into one category or the other, there are areas of society that do not fit well into this dualism. For this reason, I am proposing a third, middle-ground level of racial project: the meso-level. This level includes organisations that have both structural and cultural elements at work within them and have roles in reinforcing racial identification and meaning. The distinction is that the meso-level is not as far removed from individuals as the macro-level, but
Unlike the micro-level, racial interactions are structured through small-scale institutionalisation. Community organisations are one example of this type of racial project. They function at a much smaller scale than government institutions; however, among those involved is a structure that is not present in non-organised, interpersonal interactions. They are also able to interact with macro-level organisations with the relative power and influence they have through acting as a collectivity.

The omission of an explicit conceptualisation of a meso-level racial project illustrates a larger pattern of macro/micro dichotomy prevalent in the social sciences (Faist 2010; Fine 2012; Johnson 2008). Between the macro focus of larger structures (e.g., the state) and the micro focus of individuals is a meso-level that focuses on groups. Gary Alan Fine defines “group” as an aggregation of persons that is characterized by shared place, common identity, collective culture, and social relations, although groups vary in the extent to which they apply” (Fine 2012: 160). At the group level, there are distinct types of relational interactions and structures that distinguish it from both macro- and micro-level dynamics (Faist 2010).

A meso-level analysis focuses on social ties rooted in geographic, racialised, kinship, friendship, and/or formal organisation (Faist 2010). Specifically, the analysis focuses on the relational interactions that happen within and across these types of collectivities. Specific focus of social phenomena at the meso-level is important in understanding how relational concepts—such as affiliation and community—are generated (Fine 2012). Further, the interactions between meso-level groups and macro-level groups can reveal the mechanisms through which relative power influence social interactions as macro-levels shape meso-levels, and vice versa.

**Contrasting Macro and Meso**

Omi and Winant outline two types of racial projects: macro-level and micro-level. Both types use signifying practices as ways to form and structure social inequality.
For my research, the national census bodies are an example of a macro-level racial project; one that occurs at structural, institutional levels. The state is one of the highest-level institutions within national borders, so it is a significant one on which to focus for my investigation. In contrast, mixed race organisations do not fit well within a macro- or micro-level designation. Mixed race organisations share some of the characteristics of macro-level projects; they are (small-scale) institutions and play a role in the process of mixed race construction. However, mixed race organisations are not large-scale institutions and therefore have a limited reach of influence within the greater population. Some operate on smaller local or regional scales, and all of them have some form of interaction with those who they aim to represent. Micro-level racial projects are reserved for personal interactions between individuals, into which mixed race organisations also do not quite fit. Therefore, my research will examine mixed race organisations as a meso-level racial project. Creating a continuum of macro-, meso-, and micro-level racial projects may help to understand the racialisation processes that occur in institutions that have some elements of macro- and micro-level projects, or that may otherwise not neatly fit at either pole. My research will test out the meso-level racial project designation as one of authority and representation. However, it is also one where the mechanism of interaction between the organisation and those it represents is also a significant aspect of racial formation, which differs from micro-level projects that do not have this dynamic.

As my interests in the thesis are specifically around the ways that influence and power contribute to racialisation processes, my research will be limited to macro-level and meso-level racial projects. It is at these two levels where mixed race is created, articulated, and contested with potentially wide-reaching effects. Although the micro-level is an important aspect of racialisation processes, the particular dynamics of collectivities will be the focus of my research.

**CROSS-NATIONAL COMPARATIVE FRAMEWORK**

Our world continues in its process of globalisation; in particular, with regard to the increasing prevalence of people migration and multiculturalism/cultural pluralism.
As such, it is imperative that the study of race moves beyond the local space. More complex and sophisticated analyses will consider the various racialisation processes happening simultaneously across the globe, which in turn also inform one another (Bhattacharyya et al. 2002; Essed and Goldberg 2002). Researching the way that mixed race is constructed across national contexts requires a cross-national comparative framework. My study sites reflect (part of) my background and my current residential location in the choice to study the United States and Great Britain, respectively. More importantly, the trans-Atlantic slave trade, colonial, and racialisation social histories of the two nations make them practical and logical locations for cross-national comparison of racialised ideologies (Small 1994a). Furthermore, by doing a comparative study, the concepts can be further problematised by the different ways a “similar” concept (i.e., “mixed race”) is understood in multiple contexts.

Despite the recent anthologies, *International Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Mixedness and Mixing* (Edwards et al. 2012) and *Global Mixed Race* (King-O’Riain et al. 2014), there has been little attempt to examine racialisation and racialised relations through systematic international comparison (Bhattachayya et al. 2002; Small 1994a). The repercussion of not doing so is that there remains a relatively limited scope and depth to understandings about racialisation processes generally and globally, as knowledge remains context-dependent. This also leads to theoretical and conceptual issues, as most studies remain localised (Small 1994a). In the case of the United States and Britain, many studies on race and racialisation have been carried out over decades, which have limited applicability outside of their national contexts in isolation. However, the lack of systematic comparative studies does not preclude the use of international theories and empirical work being used as support. Stephen Small notes that in British studies on race, there are frequent uncritical references to research from the United States. In contrast, there are much fewer references in US literature to British studies, or from any other nation, for that matter (Small 1994a). The uncritical use of research from a different context and the lack of use of outside sources to inform national work leads to “many errors and
misinterpretations, superficial comparisons, distortions and over-simplifications” (Small 1994a: 5).

I am relying on the comparative framework of Stephen Small (1994a), whose work has frequently compared racialised experiences in the United States and Britain, as well as other locations in the African Diaspora (Bhattacharyya et al. 2002; Hine et al. 2009; King-O’Riain et al. 2014; Small 1994a; Small 1994b). He argues that cross-national comparison must be conceptually clear, theoretically driven, and empirically grounded in order to reach the goal of identifying and analysing “continuities and discontinuities across historical and cultural contexts” (Small 1994a: 16). Contextualisation provides a way through which to consider my research strategies and interrogate that which may be taken for granted for a given research site.

Small argues that comparative studies must be founded upon existing research. That being said, cross-national comparison allows for renewed consideration for theory, paradigms, and concepts that are used when exploring racialisation in a singular context. As noted above, racialisation processes in Britain have been largely influenced by or grounded in theories generated in the United States. Comparative analysis allows for evaluating the conclusions found in such research. Conversely, in the US case where there is not much informing from other national contexts, comparative analysis opens a pathway through which to examine to what extent theories that are presented as universally normative actually are. The findings from comparative analysis can be framed within the larger debate on how useful universal versus context-specific theories are when comparing social phenomena (Small 1994a).

For Small, there is a clear connection between research on racialisation processes and cross-national comparative investigation.

In comparisons we see most lucidly the social construction of ‘race’, and thus ‘race’ (and class) cease to be objective realities innocently reflecting natural divisions of humankind. Rather, they become social
inventions, constructions amenable to our critical activity, and subject to modification, manipulation and negotiation.


Race is constructed through social, historical, and political influences. By conducting comparative analyses, the impacts of structural and specific cultural and ideological influences are brought to the fore. The variable of nation becomes a clear referent through which to analyse similar and differing patterns and processes of racialisation (Omi and Winant 1986; Small 1994a).

Clear, systematic cross-national comparison is an important framework through which to explore social phenomena. As they are formed through social construction, it is sensible to examine similar phenomena in more than one context to highlight the different mechanisms of their operationalisation. Comparison can have an important role in testing and refining theories, concepts, and paradigms that may otherwise be taken for granted within localised literature. The roles of the state and institutions are made more obvious by highlighting the processes that create and maintain racialisation from nation to nation. Though cross-national comparison, theories can be refined for wider applicability, or be explicitly qualified for the localities in which they were discovered.

CONCLUSION

Mixed race scholarship is wide and varied, though it generally can be thought of as fitting into pathological, celebratory, and critical paradigms. In this chapter, I have overviewed the shifting discourses and theories of racialised mixedness throughout the racial histories of the United States and Britain. I have shown how mixed race theories are rooted in a similar notion to mixed raced pathology stemming from imperialism and colonialism, and from the 1990s has emerged into celebratory narratives that construct mixed race as a viable racialised category. Mixed race studies are contested, so I have also explored some of the criticisms of theorisation. I then turned to outline my theoretical framework race studies, showing how racial formation theory can be used to analyse the processes that construct mixed race. As articulated by Omi and Winant, macro-level and micro-level racial projects are conceptualised as sites for racial formation. The theory does not explicitly
conceptualise meso-level racial projects, so I argued why meso-level investigation would be useful to include in the theoretical framework. Meso-level focus helps to understand the ways that intra-personal groups and organisations also act as sites for racial projects and the social processes of racialisation that occur at relational levels. Finally, I outlined a comparative framework through which to compare the United States and Britain.

This chapter has highlighted a need for race critical analysis within mixed race theorisation in both the United States and Britain. In contemporary studies, micro-level mixed race identity and experience have been a focus, but research examining the influence of macro-level and meso-level social structures have been less researched and understood.

In reviewing current literature, it becomes apparent that whilst there is theory and research on racialised mixedness in the US and in Britain, there is not much theoretical or empirical work that aims to bring the two bodies of work together. Though the United States and Britain have shared early colonial and racial scholarship histories, the racial trajectories in both nations have diverged along different pathways in response to unique and specific socio-historical influences. Because of this, racialised mixedness “looks different” in each nation. The research in both nations has its strengths and weaknesses in approaches, assumptions, and findings. I argue that through bringing the two together within their understood contexts, research on the processes of racial formation can be strengthened in both nations, as they can mutually inform and influence one another.

For my research, I have chosen to examine the US and British national censuses as a macro-level project and mixed race organisations as a meso-level project. Both have important functions in the creation and maintenance of the state. The process of racialised categorisation helps to form the state in the first place (Goldberg 2002; Kertzer and Arel 2002; Omi and Winant 1994). This institution of the racialised state works to create meaning, interpretation, and reinforcement of race and racial categories among the society within each particular contextual articulation. In this
way, racial categorisation of the state becomes a normalised way of creating and ascribing difference among populations at community levels. These processes described are mechanisms by which macro-level and meso-level racial projects participate in racial formation, as sites of power and influence. Although the latter is closer on the continuum to an example of “micro-level” racial projects than the former, it remains removed from the individual and everyday projects described by that level. Both are removed and therefore non-equivalent to micro-level individuals speaking on their own behalves about racial categorisation, personal meanings, and conceptions of mixed race. In both macro-levels and meso-levels, few become the voice for many—that is the dynamic in which I am interested for this research project, as it pertains to articulating and constructing mixed race.

Examining the racialised discourses and practices in depth will increase understanding of racial formation at state (macro) and social organisational (meso) levels; the latter of which has not been focused on in the original racial formation development. Furthermore, this knowledge can be used to better understand racial construction processes more generally within the United States and Britain, as well as help to develop a theory of mixed race within a comparative framework that can be applied more broadly to understand mixed race constructions on a more global scale.

In the next chapter, I will explore my methodology that will guide me to addressing my research questions. I also explain my research methods, including how I collected and analysed my data. I also reflect on the research processes and issues I encountered whilst completing my field work.
Chapter Three: Methodology

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

My research aims to add to the body of Critical Mixed Race Studies (CMRS) by examining the ways that race is formed through macro-level and meso-level racial projects in the United States and Great Britain. It aims to examine how census organisations construct mixed race through the official census reports. It also examines the ways that mixed race organisation representatives describe and construct notions of mixed race through their work. The research also explores the interactions and contestations between the two types of racial projects in each nation that form an important role of contemporary racial formation around mixed race. The thesis is interested in examining the ways influence and power shape racialisation processes. It will explore the ways these processes and interactions are similar in both nations as well as how they differ.

The review in the previous chapter of the main trajectories and theoretical approaches in contemporary mixed race studies in the United States and Britain reveals that there is a gap in the research vis-à-vis examining the relationship of organisational power and creating racialised constructions. Therefore, in order to investigate constructions of mixed race and power, I developed the following three research questions:

- How do census organisations in the United States and Britain utilise discourses to construct the concept of “mixed race”?
- How do macro-level and meso-level organisations in the United States and Britain engage with each other in order to form constructions of mixed race?
- How do meso-level mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain conceptualise and operationalise the construction of “mixed race”?

In this chapter, I will explain my approach to the research and justify my research methods. I begin by reviewing how a race critical approach informed the methodological approach, which focuses on examining discursive practices.
Following, I outline the methods and rationale for my data collection. This sets the stage for the empirical research in the proceeding chapters.

**SETTING THE CONTEXT**

“Race” is a word and a notion that is used in multiple ways at once in common parlance (Essed 1991; Glasgow 2009; Zack 2002). On one level, it is often acknowledged as a social construct that has no biological basis (Coates 2013, 2015; Glasgow 2009). Yet still on another, it is used commonly as a way of describing, categorising, and stratifying people in society—both from authoritative social institutions and from those individuals who are being categorised (Garner 2010; Kertzer and Arel 2002; Mason 1999). As discussed in Chapter Two, racial formation theory has been influential in shaping my thoughts around the processes of racialisation, the importance of time and space in the shaping of racialisation, and the ways that macro-level and meso-level organisations function as racial projects and as locations of racial formation in different ways. As such, centring my research on racial formation theory shapes the ways that I develop my research methodology,

I am approaching my research with a race critical consciousness—one that rigorously problematises and critiques the notions of and assumptions around racial categories and constructions. Moving beyond merely acknowledging the social aspects of race, my approach interrogates and deconstructs racialised concepts as they are articulated by those ascribing them (Essed and Goldberg 2002; Yosso and Solórzano 2005). In my own personal positioning, I am a person who is often racialised as “monoracial.” However, I have a diverse background that is not reflected by this external racialisation. I have many critical questions about mixed race scholarship that stem from my positioning, for instance, “Am I considered ‘mixed race’ or ‘monoracial’?” “Is there more to ‘race’ than external phenotypic markers?” “How do/can ‘nationality’ or ‘ethnicity’ fit into the construction of ‘mixed race’?” Mixed race scholarship has not often interrogated notions of “mixed race” and the variety of aspects of its social construction (cf. Brunsma 2006; Sexton 2008; Spencer 1999, 2006, 2010). Scholarship has instead largely remained
situated within societal racial paradigms without rigorous challenges to the status quo.

Within race critical theories, I am able to orient my inquiry from a race critical standpoint, which questions and interrogates racialised discourse. Especially in “mixed race” studies, this has not been done much in the early contemporary theorisation, and only recently are scholars starting to approach mixed race from an explicitly race critical perspective (Daniel et al. 2014; R. Spencer 2014). Subsequently, there is a large gap in the research around notions of race, racial construction, power relationships, and racial formation processes generally vis-à-vis mixed race. With my research, I hope to begin to address that gap by exploring mixed race at the discursive level and analysing and problematising notions of mixedness (Spencer 2004).

My research focuses on organisations, in contrast to individuals. This is not to say that individuals are not important in understanding racialised constructions. Rather, the majority of mixed race studies focus on mixed race at an individual level; therefore, the aim of my research is to investigate mixed race construction from an alternative angle. The influence of power structures within mixed race communities on the experiences of people racialised as mixed race is another identified gap in mixed race literature. My research highlights internal power structures by focusing on the leadership within the organisations, who set the goals and agenda for their work and influence who is and is not included as mixed race for their purposes.

**Research Design**

_Development of Research Terminology_

I used my review of the US and British literature and initial reviews of mixed race at various organisational levels (i.e., social organisations, mass- and social media, and academia) to survey the racialised terminology used to discuss the research topics. What I found, especially for researchers and organisations that worked with diverse membership or membership that was international in some capacity, was that “mixed race” was the term that was most commonly understood, encompassing,
acceptable, and non-offensive for organisations based both in the United States and Britain (Edwards et al. 2012; DaCosta 2007; Ifekwunigwe 2004; King-O’Riain et al. 2014). For this reason, I elected to use “mixed race” for my generalised term throughout the research process, in both the United States and Britain.

**Macro-Level and Meso-Level Mixed Racial Projects**

As covered in Chapter Two, racial formation theory originally was developed in order to explore the relationship between macro-level and micro-level racial projects in the processes of racialisation (Omi and Winant 1986, 1994, 2015). There has been some research that focuses on the interactions between the census organisations and individuals (Aspinall 2003; Caballero 2004; DaCosta 2007; Kertzer and Arel 2002; Perlmann and Waters 2002; Skerry 2000; Song 2012; Thompson 2012). Fewer studies have focused on the interactions of mixed race organisations and individuals (Sexton 2008; Spencer 1999, 2011). However, there has been hardly any research of the interaction between the census organisations and mixed race organisations, particularly situated in Britain. The US-based research largely covers the so-called “Multiracial Movement” (DaCosta 2007, Hochschild et al. 2012, Perlmann and Waters 2002, Williams 2005, 2006), but does not focus analyses at the level of racialised constructions. From the perspective of racial formation, the interaction of the state and mixed race organisations becomes a logical place to situate my research, as the kinds of interactions between the two will help to identify the ways that mixed race is constructed at different social levels with power and influence. In turn, this helps to contextualise mixed race construction more broadly.

National census organisations and mixed race organisations are examples of “non-micro-level” projects. As Chapter Two outlined, the former fits well within established racial formation theory, as the macro-level racial projects are those that are related to the state. Racialised classification is one aspect of the state project, which is undertaken through the census. The specific census organisations in both the US and Britain, thus, are my focal point for researching mixed race constructions at the macro-level. Mixed race organisations are not immediately as
clear, regarding how they fit into racial formation theory. Mixed race organisations cannot be micro-level projects because they are comprised of a collection of individuals. However, these organisations are not (necessarily) affiliated with the state, so they are not macro-level projects, either. These bodies function in ways that create, advocate, support, speak on behalf of—represent—collected individuals and families, though the power dynamics embodied are not on the same scale as a state (Faist 2010; Fine 2012; Johnson 2008; Rydgren 2003). Instead of examining racial projects within a binary, I posit that it is more useful to examine the middle spaces—what I have termed the “meso-level.” Within this space, projects that have a role in classification are mixed race organisations, which organise around mixed race and, in the process, engage with whom they see as being within that categorisation. This construction work is different from what happens on the macro-level, but it is no less important when trying to understand the overall racialisation processes within societies.

The ideas and meanings of mixed race, in turn, are applied to or implemented by an organised body, which uses its power and influence to organise and represent a population (DaCosta 2007; Hunter 1953). This process, by way of racial formation, functions to fix notions of mixed race within a given moment. Influential bodies with relative power benefit from this process, as they function to represent individuals and maintain a sense of social order through the appearance of uniformity.

**Research Sites**

As I focused my enquiry on macro-level and meso-level project interactions, I used the 2000/2010 US censuses and the 2001/2011 censuses for England and Wales as my data sources for the US Census Bureau/Office of Management and Budget and the Office for National Statistics, respectively. My research focused particularly around the time that mixed race was added as a racialised option on the census; therefore, the primary data focused on the 2000/2001 census round. The 2010/2011 census round data were a secondary source, when applicable. The censuses are macro-level racial projects, which make them a logical tool for studying racial classifications and constructions. The options provided on a census
form to a population are undoubtedly connected to the ways in which respondents identify themselves, thus influencing racialised constructions (Anderson 1991; Kertzer and Arel 2002). Furthermore, the US and British censuses function both as representatives and representations of each nation. Each census organisation is part of a larger state entity that maintains and governs over a specified geographical area and the inhabitants dwelling within it. Census organisations specifically are overseers of the enumeration of the governed population; as such, they are responsible for the many types of categorisations of populations—namely of interest in my research: racial categorisation.

Similarly, I used mixed race community organisations as meso-level research sites. The organisation profiles, including overviews of what each does and the specific people each work with, can be found in Appendix B. The particularities of the various bodies are wide-ranging, but the similarity among the groups that I queried is that they organise themselves based on the commonality of a constructed notion of “mixed race.”

These smaller bodies are also situated within each nation. They act with some power and influence, as a means to make known the interests of their social groups organising around mixed race to the larger governing nation-state. These processes take place in a range of ways through racial projects. Examples include campaigning for acknowledgement or equal rights to government agencies, or forming relational and friendship groups where individuals collect and affirm their racialised identities among themselves and their local communities. The goal for wider racialised recognition, along with the use of and advocacy for a categorisation scheme describing race and racial mixedness, is influenced by the state project of racial categorisation and the census. The range of these goal activities are influenced by the state, and they are part of the process of racial formation (Goldberg 2002; Kertzer and Arel 2002; Omi and Winant 1994).
Facet Methodology

The two racial projects that I investigated articulate mixed race constructions through different fora. Therefore, I opted to use more than one method to generate data. Facet methodology, developed by Jennifer Mason, allows for the strategic use of multiple strategies in order to illuminate different aspects—or facets—for different but related lines of enquiry. This methodology assumes that the social world is multi-dimensional, yet entwined. As such, the multiple methods used provide insight into the different types of data collected (Mason 2011).

The two methods that I used to explore mixed race constructions are discourse analysis and interview narrative. For the census organisations, the discourse analyses used official texts that were published by state bodies directly. They set racialised terms for each nation and detail the descriptions of race. When examined more closely, they exposed the underpinning ideology of racialised construction in each context. Beginning with these analyses also helped to provide an overview and context for the following analyses of mixed race organisations. The interviews of mixed race organisation representatives provided text that potentially moved beyond the official state position and articulated a complementary account of racialisation. Additionally, the document and interview analyses represented two types of racial projects, which also provided a diversity of data with which to compare racial formation. A multiple qualitative methods approach for this study had advantages over a single methods approach; it addressed the research questions from more than one perspective and provided a more thorough account of the studied phenomena.

In this research design, the different types of data were collected and analysed in tandem to draw out meaningful themes and conclusions. Similar to Jennifer Mason, Robert Burgess suggests that field researchers use “multiple research strategies” that are appropriate for the research questions in order to avoid narrow and inadequate data collection, such as a combination of survey, observation, and interviewing methods (Brannen 1992; Burgess 1995; Mason 2011). This project used an approach based on a “between method” approach, which is to use more
than one method for the same study subject. This produced richer data from the organisations than the use of only one method approach (Berg and Lune 2011; Brannen 1992; Denscombe 2007; Denzin 1989; Mason 2011). The project used multiple sources of data, which were generated through two different qualitative methods used throughout the research. Discourse analysis and informant interviews represented different levels of social organisational analysis (census and organisation), as well as different sources for the data (the macro-level and meso-level projects within both nations). The idea behind my approaches—and mixed methods more generally—is that by intentionally approaching the research questions from more than one perspective, the richness of the data will help to reveal more themes than one data source alone. By using the different methods in this way, the datasets were used in tandem in order to gain a better understanding of the differing articulations of mixed race by census organisations and mixed race organisations.

In using discourse analysis, the first phase of my research used a novel qualitative approach to analyse national census outputs. Quantitative approaches are nearly the exclusive approach for census organisations to assess mixed race categorisation in both countries (Denscombe 2007). That being said, there are a few examples of qualitative analyses used to research census outcomes and implications (Ballard 1996; Hainer 1987). My qualitative research aims to contribute to the existing body of quantitative census data and associated research on race and racialisation. Instead of duplicating methodology to analyse census responses, I positioned my research in an alternative direction and “analysed the analyses.” I aimed to examine the ways in which mixed race is conceptualised and constructed by two nation-states by both looking at the reporting of census results by census bodies and at the conclusions they draw about mixed race in the process.

The second phase of the research relied primarily on interview analysis data from mixed race organisations through semi-structured interviews. I decided to use semi-structured interviews so that I could both make sure that I asked the same set
of questions to each participant, but also had the flexibility to allow the discussion to lead to different aspects of mixed race construction.

The next section will focus on the nature of the data sources. I first examine the context of the census and the various data that it generates, and how this makes for a beneficial source for my research enquiry. Following, I turn to outline my approach to generating data from the mixed race organisations.

**Data Sources**

Census data in both the United States and Britain are collected within a quantitative framework. The census questionnaires ask questions that eventually yields standardised data for a wide range of government and public users, once the responses are coded and reviewed by statisticians and demographers. I have prioritised the reporting of the standardised data as the focus of my enquiry, through the race critical lens outlined above.

The national census is a logical tool to use in my research in order to uncover and examine the broad descriptions of the notion of race generally, and of mixed race more specifically. Furthermore, the census data and analytical reports can be used to view other demographic and socioeconomic trends for people who select mixed-designation category options. The presumption behind the census process is that the data will be representative of the entire national population. Inevitably, there are portions of the population that are missed in the enumeration, which is known as a “differential undercount.” Consequently, in terms of fullness and accuracy, the national census in both nations is not without its problems (Choldin 1994; Prewitt 2000; Simpson 2003; Teague 2000). This is particularly problematic for counting the numbers of those identifying as mixed race, as the numbers are comparatively small among the general populations of both nations. However, the small numbers do not affect my research scope; therefore, the data remain relevant and useful for my research. The national census is still used interdisciplinarily as a primary tool for gaining a general demographic description for each nation. It is also used for more detailed analyses and subsequent conclusions made by census
organisations about the populations on which it chooses to publish reports. Finally, the structure of the census and the quantitative analyses assume a cause and effect dynamic—whether explicitly or implicitly—among the different variables in its analyses. Therefore, the census is an appropriate tool to examine the mixed race categories, with regard to the ways that they are used alongside socioeconomic indicators (e.g., education, employment, and housing) to critique and problematise predictive assumptions and the subsequent conclusions drawn by census analysts.

In the first research phase, I used the census data analyses as a starting place to shape the focus of research on the mixed race organisations. I continued a qualitative approach for the examination of the mixed race organisations in order to use the accounts of representatives, in their organisational work and personal anecdotes, to examine the ways that they and their organisations conceptualise notions of and construct mixed race. Mixed race organisations aim to work in close relation to the people they serve, and therefore generally maintain direct and personal connections with the users of their organisations (Dalmage 2004; Perlmann and Waters 2002). It is from this place of connection where mixed race organisations perhaps differ from nation-state bodies, which do not utilise direct and personal connections with “users” (national inhabitants) in the same ways in order to identify and address concerns of social inequality and discrimination, and shape policy.

Through my research, I examined the differences between the macro-level and meso-level projects. In order to draw out the positions and experiences of those leading organisations, I used a qualitative approach to collect data from mixed race organisations on an individual and in-depth basis. This approach limited the research to a small number of participants. An alternative method could have been a large-scale quantitative survey, if I had focused not on discursive practices, but solely on content or demographic means towards racialised constructions. Instead, I wanted to be able to probe further than would be possible if I used a predetermined-response survey, or even an open-ended questionnaire with limited space and time to fill in responses. I wanted to move past automatic, prescribed, or
edited responses in order to uncover nuance and candidness better accessible in more conversational-style data collection.

Additionally, the approach allowed me to explore how the research participants made sense of the world, from their particular positioning within the mixed race organisations at the time of the interview. Thus, if the interviews were repeated today with the same organisations and individuals, it is likely that the data would be different from that which was collected during the original interviews. This “snap-shot” position was important for my research goals, as my aim was to collect “on the ground” or “real life” data from organisational representatives. At the same time, it remained a step removed from the individuals that make up the “represented” mixed race populations of the mixed race community organisations and the census bodies. Some of the representatives described themselves as mixed race, as well, but it is their place of leadership and accompanying influence and power that is of particular interest in this study. Given these considerations, the data collected were analysed within an interpretive framework that sought to understand their conceptions and constructions of “mixed race.” This included analysing data relating to the experiences of the research informants.

*Mixed Race Discourses*

For both types of mixed race projects, I examined the discourses about mixed race that were generated in both settings and used to describe and construct mixed race. For this reason, I was mindful about the specific types of data sources that I use to achieve this end. My definition and use of discourse followed the Foucauldian notion of discourse as text “that create[s] and construct[s] the fields and institutions they seek to explicate and serve” (Ali 2003: 30). This definition is useful in that it acknowledges the conveying of information (knowledge), and that the sources for this type of discourse must have some ability (power) to do so. This complimented my aim to research macro-level and meso-level organisations in how they construct mixed race.
I focused on two types of racial projects, with the assumption that they would produce differing discourses on mixed race. I also assumed that there was likely some overlap and linkages between the two types of sources, in which I am also interested. Discourses are localised texts, in that they are specific to particular times, spaces, and social contexts; and furthermore, communicate that particularity to express and understand human experiences in that locality (Ali 2003; Tyson 1999; Whisnant 2009). Therefore, discursive texts are versatile sources for analysing the language, culture, social institutions; and the assumptions and environments from which they come. Discourses cover a variety of areas of life and therefore are not confined to a specific type of text (Foucault 1972; Whisnant 2009). For this reason, I selected census report and policy documents and interview texts as primary data sources. Particularly for the interview texts, I wanted to make sure to use forms of data that are interpersonal in nature. There is knowledge that is present and conveyed in narrative forms of dialogue that is unique and worth analysing:

Stories express a kind of knowledge that uniquely describes human experience and actions and happenings contribute positively and negatively to attaining goals and fulfilling purposes.

In the interview process, the articulated knowledge is both narrative and paradigmatic in nature (Polkinghorne 1995). Therefore, this type of generated discourse was useful alongside the other sources for examining descriptions and conceptions of mixed race more deeply, through the process of interaction. There are undoubtedly other forms of texts that I could have selected to analyse these discourses, but my chosen data sources are satisfactory in that their intended audience are those outside of the organisations.

With “discourse” comes implied “power” and “knowledge,” as mentioned above.

Indeed, it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together. And for this very reason, we must conceive discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable. To be more precise, we must not imagine a world of discourse divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse, or between the dominant discourse and the dominated one;
but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies.
Foucault 1978: 100.

Foucault argues that discourse is not necessarily linear or uniform, but rather varying elements work with (or against) each other in the struggle for power and knowledge. This argument is useful for understanding how my data fit together. In examining different types of discourses from differing sites across two nations, I attempted to use the various texts as means to examine the different types of knowledge and power that is generated, accepted, and contested. I was interested in the similarities between and among the macro-level and meso-level organisations and their national contexts. I was also interested in the differences, inconsistencies, and contestations across the specific elements of discourse. My aim was to understand in more sophisticated detail the nuances in the constructions of mixed race across these sites, which became apparent through the use of discursive texts from differing sites.

Next, I turn to giving an overview of the data collection and analyses process in more detail. I also reflect on any issues that arose while conducting my research.

**DOING THE RESEARCH**

*Census Data Collection and Analysis*

I analysed official reports published by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB, on behalf of the US Census Bureau) and the Office for National Statistics (ONS) (England and Wales) for the descriptions, conceptions, and constructions of mixed race populations from the 2000/2010 US censuses and the 2001/2011 censuses in England and Wales. The findings from these analyses are explored in

---

4 The British analysis was limited to England and Wales for purposes of practicality. There is not one census for the whole of the United Kingdom or for Great Britain, though the censuses that occur simultaneously during each census cycle are designed for broad aggregation after the fact. The censuses for Scotland and Northern Ireland are conducted by their own national organisations, and therefore have varying census formats—including in the ethnic categorisations. Therefore, this research project focused on England and Wales. This covers most of the United Kingdom nation-state in terms of population numbers. It is also the most “specific” when describing the different ethnic mixes used as official categories, in that it has the most specific number of ethnic breakdowns that are then collapsed as necessary when aggregated with the rest of the UK data.
in Chapter Four.

I collected the publications made available from the US Census Bureau and ONS websites that discussed census findings relating broadly to “cultural demographics” (e.g., race, ethnicity, religion), as well as “socioeconomic demographics” (e.g., education and employment data). I conducted a critical discourse analysis (CDA) starting from the main publications overviewing race and ethnicity and mixed race populations. CDA is a particular analytical approach that examines the relationship between authority and the use of language (Fairclough 2010; Keller 2013; van Dijk 1993, 2001). The primary purpose of these publications is to provide public users (e.g., researchers, community organisations, students, and everyday citizens) a way to learn more about the justification for the national census, the information that is collected, the process by which it is collected, a summary and interpretation of the information, and the uses of this information in the governance of each country (Grieco and Cassidy 2001; Jones and Bullock 2012; ONS 2012; Rendall 2005).

My critical discourse analysis focused on the principles of discourse that look at both the ways language is used in specific contexts (i.e., macro-level and census organisations), as well as examining the meanings constructed in text through the lens of social theory (i.e., racial formation theory) (Lillis and McKinney 2003). After the initial reading of the documents, I conducted the CDA using three levels of analysis. First, the documents were analysed on the descriptive level of phrases and themes. Following the phrase-level analysis, where key and salient phrases were noted, the phrases were used as a guiding point to identify the themes for the second analysis of the documents. The themes expanded on the specific phrases in the documents to include ideas and topics that are discussed in the national discourse of mixed race. The thematic analyses were used to examine descriptions and patterns found in the documents. These elements form a particular discourse and show how each nation is conceptualising and presenting mixed race to the general population.
The following stage in the analysis was at the interpretive level. I revisited the phrases and themes that had arisen from the first two readings of the documents and selectively synthesised them in order to gain a fuller picture of how each country was describing those identifying as mixed race. I also examined how this could be interpreted by the users of the reports. This analysis allowed meaning in the discourse to be uncovered and examined, making use of the racial formation theoretical framework to further analyse it. After these data were analysed, I went on to further analyses in order to compare the ways that the two countries report about their mixed race populations.

The final stage of the discourse analyses was to use the discourse analyses from the previous descriptive and interpretive readings in an explanatory analysis to connect my findings to wider social theory and cultural context. Remaining in the racial formation theoretical perspective, I connected the census discourse on mixed race to the larger context by first comparing the documents to each other, as well as drawing on additional data sources from the census bodies, as appropriate, as well as other research conducted on the nation-states and issues of race and ethnicity.

I had the opportunity to interview employees of the census organisations. Information I gathered through these means complemented the document analyses outlined above and helped to enrich my discourse analyses. The communications included telephone and electronic message queries to both the US Census Bureau and Office for National Statistics customer services departments. In both cases, these customer services departments are especially set up to assist members of the public to access information on the censuses and obtain publications and other data products. Through the advice of customer services representatives, as well as personal contacts at the University of Manchester, I was able to access employees working for the ONS on the 2011 census consultation. I attended a consultation meeting at the ONS where primarily academic users of census data were providing feedback on the proposed ethnicity questions for the 2011 census. Following the meeting, I was able to communicate further with two workers: informally with one
and a semi-structured interview with the other. Through these various interactions, I was able to ask specific questions that I had about the census process in Britain. I was also able to obtain information about the official ethnic categories used on the 2001 census and the coding practices used in processing and analysing the census responses. Finally, I also was able to seek clarification and additional information about areas of ambiguity I found in the census discourse.

In both the US and Britain, it was fairly easy to access individuals to speak to within the US Census Bureau and the ONS. The customer services telephone lines fit with the overall positive public relations image that both census organisations put forward vis-à-vis accessibility and relevance to their entire national populations. The difference between my experiences of accessibility occurred when speaking with the representatives working with the census data. I attempted to speak to three representatives in Britain, however only two responded to my enquiries. Both of the ones I spoke to were tentative and somewhat reticent in our telephone communications. The first employee I spoke to had not remembered me from the meeting, and seemed suspicious of my questions and my interest in the census process. I found it difficult to obtain information from him because he answered questions with short, ambiguous answers; and did not elaborate much on follow-up questions. I had met the second employee on at least two occasions at different meetings before interviewing him, so he had a little familiarity with me when we spoke on the telephone. There was less hostility in his demeanour, however I sensed some apprehension throughout our interview. He seemed nervous or on edge, which was different from his demeanour during the consultation meeting that he had led. In both interviews, I found the apprehension to be in stark contrast to the customer services representatives, who may be more used to the public relations side of ONS outreach.

In contrast, the US representative was warm, forthcoming, and eager to share her reports, research, ideas, and opinions. She offered me publications that were not yet released to the public in one instance, and she maintained communication with me about relevant updates. Furthermore, she provided me with contact details for
mixed race organisations in the US to query for potential interviews. This particular employee not only worked for the Census Bureau, but also had long-standing personal interests in the campaigns for a multiracial category. Our mutual interest for research in census classification made for an easy interview process and useful information for follow-up data sources, which ultimately led to improved data quality.

*Mixed Race Organisations Data Collection and Analysis*

The remaining empirical research focusing on mixed race community organisations can be divided into two parts. I began researching mixed race community organisations based in both the United States and Britain using current literature around the topic, personal communications, and the internet. From the literature and a personal communication, I knew that there have been estimates of current and active mixed race organisations numbered in the seventies in the United States in the latter half of the 2000s decade (DaCosta 2007; Hochschild 2007; Williams 2005, 2006). I could not find any literature giving estimates in Britain. I assumed that the number would be significantly smaller due to a smaller national population size and the differing histories around advocacy. I sought a range of organisations in order to capture a scope of community, support, advocacy, and policy goals of the various organisations in both nations. For my purposes, the organisations I sought were confined to those that work primarily with mixed race individuals and interethnic/interracial families, and initially did not include organisations with a primary focus of transracial adoption. This was because I wanted to confine my focus to organisational descriptions and conceptions of *individuals* constructed as “mixed race.” Whilst transracial adoption does work with individuals categorised as such, in most cases, this is only a part of the wider demographic accessing transracial adoption agencies that have a general focus on families where the children are of differing racialised classifications to their adoptive parent(s), rather than specifically reflecting racialised mixedness. However, when transracial adoption was included in the focuses along with mixed race individuals and/or interracial families, the organisation was included for further analyses.
I conducted an in-depth content analysis of printed and electronic media (e.g., organisation websites, newsletters, policy briefs, etc.) for approximately fifteen to twenty organisations for each country, in order to gain a preliminary understanding of the varying types of organisations, as well as to begin to uncover the recurrent discourse of mixed race organisations to the public. The texts from these printed media were analysed thematically by coding relevant key words and themes, and finding relationships among the different words and themes. As the texts from the printed resources are intended for publicity and public use, their messages are intended to be simple and straightforward. Consequently, I found content analysis was an appropriate strategy for this preliminary analysis (Denscombe 2007). I was then able to use the results to shape my further research.

The table below gives an overview of the results of the content analysis. It lists the identified themes within the organisational materials that described the missions, objectives, and aims of various mixed race organisations in the USA and Great Britain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Themes</th>
<th>Thematic Details Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Local (within city/town/borough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional (county/state/adjacent counties/states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International (activity or interest outside national borders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet (website, web log [blog], video log [vlog], social media, message boards, fora, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Profiles for Outreach</td>
<td>Children/families (Children aged under 13 and parents/carers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teenagers (ages 13-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teenagers/young adults (ages 13-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College students (approximately ages 18-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adults (aged 18+, unaccompanied by parents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race Demographics</td>
<td>Self- or family-identified (in the case of children) as mixed race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Mixed race as classified on respective national census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Notions of mixed race not restricted to official racialised categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific racialised mixedness</td>
<td>o Mixed Black (Black and another race)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Black-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Hapa (Mixed East Asian and another race)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims and Missions</th>
<th>Advocacy/campaigning/organising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring racialised identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness, commentary, and representation (of mixed race and mixed race issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support (emotional/empowerment, services, legal, adoptive, community development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community/social/celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education/training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the content analysis, I approached around thirteen to fifteen of the mixed race community organisations for each country for further research. I used a multi-stage sampling technique at this stage, in which the organisations found in the overview process were pared down for the purposes of the interview study. I decided on potential organisations by considering their specific focus(es), the information available, the frequency of key themes addressed in the document analysis, and accessibility. My aim was to have every theme represented in the organisations I approached, but this was not always possible. For example, I identified Hapa groups in the United States, however I did not identify any Hapa groups based in Great Britain. Additionally, through this method, organisations that operated in relative isolation or without internet-based promotional tools were more likely to be missed in the content analysis than organisations with a stronger online presence. A further factor that was outside of my control was the availability of organisational representatives. Though a combination of representativeness and availability, this yielded seven organisations based in Britain and six organisations based in the US that agreed to participate in semi-structured interviews.
Following requests for permission to participate, I conducted semi-structured interviews either in person or by telephone with at least one individual in a position of leadership within each organisation. Each of the US interviews were with only one person. For the British organisations, there were two instances where there was more than one interviewee: one interview was with two representatives and another was mainly with one, though five other colleagues were in the office during the interview and offered insight off-and-on as organisation representatives. Two of the six interviews were in-person for the US organisations, and five of the seven were in-person for the British organisations. I decided to focus on participants in leadership positions because of the nature of my enquiry; a person or persons in leadership would be comfortable and familiar with speaking from that position of leadership about the organisation and the participants. I found this approach to be the most appropriate because leadership is part of power/knowledge and discourse, and it is from this positioning that I am examining in my research. This generally did not create any problems except for those of availability and accessibility. On occasion, it was difficult to coordinate interviews due to the organisations not having the capacity to do so, or the necessary individuals telling me that they were “too busy” to speak with me (assumed to be a polite way to express disinterest). Another factor that I believe influenced a small number of potential organisations was a suspicion of the interview process itself—my being unknown to them or being sceptical of academic researchers due to previous experiences. I gathered this from some “shutdown” I received when I mentioned my interview requests, as well as an “anti-academy” suspicion articulated to me by some of the respondents. Others asked questions of me at the beginning of the interview to learn more about me and my “research motives.” Only when they were satisfied with my answers and comfortable opening up to me were we able to shift to my interview questions.

Though some of this happened in both the US and Britain, I found that a higher proportion of the reluctance to participate came from the British organisations. One organisation that I e-mailed for an interview replied that they “did not have the resources to help me at this time.” As I was asking to speak to a representative
about their organisation, I ascertain that this was another polite expression of
disinterest. In other organisations, I sensed the reluctance at the beginning of the
interviews, where participants were cautious with their responses, and only as the
interview progressed did they begin to relax, elaborate more, and offer information
or stories about which I did not specifically enquire. Although this is normal
phenomenon for the interview process, I noticed more of this from the Britain-based
interviewees than the interviewees based in the US. Reluctance or suspicion is
likely due to a complexity of factors to which I also contribute. As someone who
has an Igbo-Nigerian name and speaks with an identifiable North American accent,
my nationality or ethnicity may not have been guessed/known by interviewees until
the start of the interview, though it would have been clearly placed as “non-British.”
Perhaps my “foreignness” factored into their discomfort, as I noticed that I was able
to develop a faster rapport with representatives who were also not originally from
Britain themselves. The one participant in Britain who was also from the United
States was one of the most open informants that I had throughout the research
process.

By contrast, my most vocally suspicious interviewee based in the US was from
Britain originally. He not only founded it “interesting” that I was from the US and
based in Britain, but was also explicitly suspicious about my being an academic
generally, and a sociologist specifically. He critiqued some of my questions as
being “myopic,” ascribed blame on my discipline for the focus on race in societies,
and criticised academia for censoring research. In comparing new media platforms
to disseminate research to peer-reviewed publications, the interviewee explained
the following:

GH: We’re available on—the internet, and let me tell you—I’ve written about this—probably the best thing that has
ever happened to the multiracial community in the world has been the internet because all of the gatekeepers who said,
“You can’t do this, you can’t do this,” are not there anymore....

Not only does he believe that the academy is unfavourable because of its
restrictions on publication, but he went further to express his disdain for academia
more broadly:
GH: It’s because of [US] American education. ...Because it’s not important to them, the only country that matters in the United States, so why do we need to know anything about anything else? And that’s the same with race and everything else. [...] But that’s—that’s the way it is and it’s particularly, um, difficult to understand when it comes from academia because the academics are often the worst. And of course it’s ridiculous when it comes from diversity experts; then it becomes just really stupid. [...] Yeah, we need to get outside of our little myopics [sic]: “America is the only way.”

This participant believed that there are problems with the perspectives and orientations coming from a US academic system. It is likely that his impassioned perspective influenced his presumptions of me throughout the interview process because of his knowledge and assumptions of my location as a US American studying race and “diversity.” Nevertheless, his willingness to participate in the interview and his bluntness with his perspectives made for a rich interview that provided a uniquely sceptical set of data. GH’s position illustrates an uneasy relationship between the academy and the community organisations. This dis-ease likely influenced my access to some organisations, which may have in turn affected the types of organisations that were willing to speak to me. Additionally, this highlights their awareness of some of the academic work on mixed race and suggests disagreement with it. This is important for academics to address because the disconnect between the community organisations and the ways they are represented in academic work may hinder how useful and applicable the latter is in addressing social reality.

Two other US-based organisations presented some difficulty during the interview process, which stemmed from their inundation with interview requests. As a result of this, the interview participants were selective about the questions they answered and were reluctant to answer questions that attempted to clarify or critique statements where taken-for-granted ideas were assumed. These tended to be questions investigating assumed racial categories or designations, for example refusing to elaborate on or qualify their racialised group labels. Another example is that CD refrained from answering specific questions about how she sees the US government describing mixed race, and whether she feels supported by the
government. However, she did offer an answer when I asked how she would like to see the governing bodies respond to mixed race. Despite these instances of reticence, as above, this difficulty helped to capture a particular group of perspectives within the larger group of mixed group organisations that align themselves closely with census categories for the purposes of their work.

The interview schedule was informed by the aforementioned content analyses of printed resources and the census analyses. I conducted the interviews with the aim of collecting data specifically about the ways each mixed race community organisations describe and conceptualise—and therefore construct—mixedness and “mixed race people,” the overall goals and missions of the organisation and the specific work they do to address any areas of social inequality and disadvantage referred to in their discourses, and on how the census and the state influence or otherwise affect the work of their community organisations.

I used framework analysis (Ritchie and Lewis 2003) to analyse the transcribed interview data through a race critical lens. The transcribed interviews were indexed and synthesised thematically, using themes both from the previous analysis on mixed race organisations and through themes that emerged from the interviews themselves. As the interview schedule was somewhat thematic in terms of the order questions were asked, some of the thematic categories were also initially developed by using the interview schedule as a guide for thematic generation. The thematic indices and syntheses were then used to identify key themes in each transcript, as well as identify links between the themes among the organisations within and across national contexts. From the thematic analysis, I developed representational generalised findings from the gathered interview data in order understand how mixed race organisations understand and communicate “mixed race,” and how they support “mixed race” individuals and families within each national context (Denscombe 2007; Richie and Lewis 2003). The findings from the mixed race organisations are explored in Chapters Five and Six.
In this qualitative work, my identity as a researcher was fully disclosed to the research participants. The observation and data collection occurred through interviews, casual and informal communications, electronic communication, and additional resources; such as informational, publicity, and policy documents received directly from the mixed race organisation representatives (not as readily accessible as the internet texts). The data generated through the latter methods of this qualitative research were used to enrich the data collected by the interviews, and were used to gain a fuller picture of the conceptions and discourses within each mixed race community organisations.

In light of ethical considerations and at the request of some of the participants, I have anonymised the identities of all research participants, as well as the mixed race organisations that they represent and any other potentially identifying information they provided during the course of the interviews.

CONCLUSION

My methodology was greatly informed by a racial formation theoretical approach. Racial formation theory provides an appropriate theoretical foundation in that it prioritises the concept of race in its enquiry. Additionally, it is used to investigate the processes of racial construction by different types of organisational bodies. Alongside racial formation theory, I also turned to race critical theories, which I used to build upon racial formation theory to create a practical methodology to achieve the specific goals of my research questions. Race critical theories move beyond traditional race theories, which make up the majority of previous mixed race scholarship. They not only describe phenomena, but also to critique phenomena and attempt to move toward social change. In my research, my aim is to begin this critique of mixed race studies, which continues to approach “mixed race” within the same racial paradigms that they claim to work against. My discourse analysis of the census reports and interview analysis of mixed race organisations offer a much needed contribution to Critical Mixed Race Studies by examining the constructions of two important bodies of power and influence that are key to the maintenance of the mixed race racial project.
The following chapter marks the beginning of my empirical enquiry by focusing on the censuses in the United States and Britain. Through critical discourse analysis, I investigate the ways in which this racial project constructs and perpetuates notions of mixedness in each nation, and how their trajectories of racial formation compare to one another.
Chapter Four: Macro-Level Mixed Race Constructions

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The United States has always had race imbedded in the census. There has been a race question on every US census since the first enumeration in 1780, when it was used as a criterion for the right to be counted as a free and full human being. In contrast, Britain added an “ethnicity” question in 1991 to explicitly categorise by racialised group, though questions of ancestry and place of birth functioned to assess racialised identity previously. In both nations, there has been an increased number of individuals choosing to identify as more than one racialised category. A significant number of respondents during the 1990 (US) and 1991 (GB) census cycles indicated racialised mixedness outside of the designated categories in both nations, creating challenges for recoding and data analysis. Subsequently, both the USA and Britain added response options on the 2000 (US) and 2001 (GB) census cycles for individuals to identify themselves as being more than one race. In the United States, mixed race individuals were given the opportunity to mark one or more racialised category. The British census created a new “Mixed Ethnicity” categories, with four subcategory options from which to select.

Following each decennial census, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Office for National Statistics (ONS) publish a series of publications detailing their findings. The set of reports focuses on both general demographic information and what the OMB or ONS deem particularly salient for the specific census cycle. The census reports become the sites of official racialised discourse from the state. Arguably, one of the most significant ways that the United States and Great Britain use the census is for determining and reinforcing racialised categories. This chapter specifically examines how the national census bodies present mixed race through these discourses: how it is constructed, conceptualised, and how it is written about by each. From there, I am interested in how these discourses fit into the larger racialised categorisation process by each state and how they compare to one another.
Within racial formation theory, the role of the macro-level racial project is of particular importance. In the way that Michael Omi and Howard Winant conceptualise it, the state sets racialised agenda and positions and micro-level racial projects either comply or resist (Omi and Winant 1994). Through this process, racialised constructions are created and refined within a given context.

The first of my major research questions is: As macro-level racial projects, how do the national censuses in the United States and Great Britain use official discourse(s) to construct mixed race? I am exploring this question by analysing census and related policy reports published by the OMB (via the United States Census Bureau) and the ONS in Britain. Each publish these types of documents and makes them freely available to the general public, for the purposes of engaging with them and sharing some of the results of the decennial census exercise. From the many demographic reports made available by each census organisation, I have selected the documents where the mixed race populations are written about specifically, as well as general reports written on race and/or ethnicity.

Specific to this chapter, for the purposes of these analyses, I have elected to use the term “mixed race” to describe populations in either country that identify as “more than one race” (US) or as a “mixed ethnicity” (GB). The purpose for my continued use of this term is that in other aspects of my research, “mixed race” tends to be the most frequently used and understood term among the different populations and organisations in both national contexts. Additionally, for the purpose of analysing these data in two countries that use different terminologies, I prefer to use a term that is not biased towards one government’s choice of official terminology at the expense of the other’s. For this chapter, when I am referring generally to individuals or populations that identify as having more than one racial or ethnic background, I use the term “mixed race.” However, when I am writing about a specific national context, I use the official terminology used on their census forms. For example, I use the term “Two or more races” for those racialised as mixed, and the term “Mixed ethnic” for the specific racialised combinations for the populations in the British context. In addition to clearly indicating when I am the one using the
term (opposed to adopting either nation’s terminology), it will enable further clarity when I analyse the specific terminologies used in each nation in the analyses below.

I have organised the sections that follow by the salient themes found within the relevant census reports. I will begin by analysing the sets of terminologies used by each state. Following, I will move to highlighted topics contained in the reports: demographic information, and areas of need. I argue that each theme is an important mechanism through which the census organisations conceptualise mixed race.

TERMINOLOGIES
The terminologies that each state uses to categorise racialised difference reveals much about the larger racialised ideology imbued within each society. During the 2000 (US) census cycle and 2001 (GB) census cycles, the option of indicating mixed race was introduced among the possible responses for racialised categorisation (see Appendix A for sample US 2000 and 2010 and England and Wales 2001 and 2011 census specimens). This was done for the first time in British census history, as a revision to the ethnicity question that had debuted in 1991. In contrast, the US has previously enumerated for specific constructions of mixedness in its history. From 1850 to 1870, 1890, 1910, and 1920; census enumerators were instructed to identify “Mulattos,” or persons of White and Black racialised heritage. In 1890, enumerators further had to identify “Quadroons” (persons with a quarter of black ancestry) and “Octoroons” (persons with an eighth of black ancestry) as subcategories of Mulatto. However, 2000 was the first time that mixed race could be indicated since self-enumeration began in the 1970, and the first that racialised mixture could be captured outside of an exclusive Black/White binary.

A similar scheme was repeated in 2010 and 2011. Although this change (and the accompanying lead up) occurred around the same time in both nations, the result

---

5 Although it was illegal during this point in United States history, there still was Black/White sexual union, and an extensive mulatto population was reported during these censuses (Perlmann and Waters 2002).
was that each state developed a different set of terminologies to refer to this population of respondents. The racialised ideologies in each nation not only influenced the particular terminologies, but further guided the subsequent analyses of these populations and the data comparisons with other racialised groups.

In this section, I will first explore each state’s discourses around the notions of “race” and “ethnicity.” Following, I will examine the specific set of terminology used by each census organisation to classify people with more than one racialised identity and overview the demographic data for racialised categories in Britain and the United States. Lastly, I will examine some of the implications of the terminologies by examining how the discourses conceptualise mixed race alongside the other racialised categories.

“Race” Versus “Ethnicity”

Generally, the US Census Bureau uses the term “race” for the classifications of groups based on a combination of racialised colour (i.e., White, Black), continental (i.e., Asian), and/or state/national/regional origin (e.g., Alaska Native, Samoan, America Indian). This is in addition to the state’s notion of “ethnicity,” which is viewed officially as a distinct concept from “race.” “Ethnicity” is described as a “separate” concept that refers only to Hispanophone origins in Latin American or the country of Spain (Hochschild et al. 2012; Jones and Smith 2001: 7).

Specifically, the OMB defines Hispanic or Latino ethnicity as “a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race” (Jones and Smith 2001: 7). Therefore, the two official ethnicities recognised are “Hispanic and Latino” and “Not Hispanic or Latino” (OMB 1997: 11). Ethnicity is said to be “distinct” from race; there is a separate question for it on the census, and one who responds with Hispanic or Latino ethnicity may also select any racialised category or categories to answer the race question (Humes et al. 2011: 2; Jones and Smith 2001: 7; OMB 1997).

In a global survey of national censuses taken around the year 2000 period, Ann Morning found that the United States was the only government out of 141
nation-states to enumerate with separate questions for “race” and “ethnicity.” She found that most nations instead used either “race” or “ethnicity” to enumerate racialised difference. Furthermore, the US is alone in specifically targeting a specific ethnic group for an ethnicity question (Morning 2008). The distinction of the two concepts for official purposes is a uniquely US discursive construction; specifically, that the only official ethnic option for the US population is the concept of Hispanicity. Other race options that could otherwise be constructed in comparable “ethnic terms” (e.g., Asian or Pacific Islander groups currently enumerated as “race,” or Arab or African groups, which are not specifically asked about on the census, but could similarly be constructed similarly to Hispanicity) do not have the same logic applied to them.

The development of and reason for “race” and “ethnicity” as distinct and separate concepts is not well articulated in the census analysis publications. According to the OMB directive standards that guide census categories, both “race” and “ethnicity” categories are not intended to imply biological or genetic references and are suggested to include social and cultural characteristics, in addition to ancestry (OMB 1997). To the extent of meaning and distinction, the only additional stipulation regarding the use of these terms is that they reflect “clear and generally understood definitions that can achieve broad public acceptance” (OMB 1997: 2). In practice, however, Hispanics/Latinos are increasingly becoming a racialised group in the United States (Almaguer 2012; Cobas et al. 2009, Hochschild et al. 2012; Rodríguez 2000, 2008; Rumbaut 2009). Hispanicity is frequently referred to as a racialised category alongside, and in comparison, to the other official ones. As outlined in the OMB directive paper and the census analyses, the term “origin” is used as a distinguisher of the different racial and ethnic categories. As both refer to “origin,” there is no obvious difference as to why Asian or African origins distinguish people groups by “race” whilst Spanish and Central and South American (except for Brazilian Lusophone) origin require the additional identifier of “ethnicity.” This is further curious, as Central and South Americans are also examples given for the “American Indian and Alaska Native” racial category and those with ancestry from Spain (as part of Europe) are given as part of the “White” racial category.
Furthermore, “ethnicity” is not exclusively used to refer to Hispanicity in popular usage. For example, “ethnicity” is commonly used as a way to establish personal identity and connection to familial immigration histories, particularly for those who can be racialised as White (Song 2003; Waters 1990). Therefore, identifiers such as Scottish-American, Irish-American, Italian-American, and Jewish-American are commonly understood to be references to ethnicity in a way distinct from the US Census. What becomes clear is the discourse around official “ethnicity” and its “separate distinction” from “race” is ambiguous in its articulation and practice at best, and illogical at worst.

For practical purposes, the remainder of these analyses will focus on the official US classification of “race.” They will include those of Hispanic and Latino “ethnicity” only if they reported more than one race on the US census, as the US census data does not have any provision for the concept of “two or more ethnicities.” As such, mention of Hispanicity when reporting on mixed race is largely absent from the larger racialised discourse on the census.

In Britain, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) refrains from using the term “race” on the census. This is reflective of increasing political unease with racial terminologies in Britain during the 1970s and 1980s (Kertzer and Arel 2002). Instead, the term “ethnicity” is used to classify groups based on a combination of racialised colour (i.e., White, Black), continental (i.e., African, Asian), and/or national/regional origin (e.g., Irish, Caribbean, Chinese). The ethnicity question is one of the main ways to capture racialised characteristics of the population. There is only one question referring to racialised ethnic origin on the British census, although there are additional questions that ask about parents’ places of birth and

---

6 The reason given for this is that during the consultations for Census 2000, while there was “considerable public concern” about the classification of mixed race populations, there was “little comment” on the option of reporting both a Hispanic/Latino ethnicity and a non-Hispanic/Latino ethnicity (OMB 1997: 8). As there were no early comments or consultations, it remained unclear how changing the question would affect the response rate. This was deemed “an item for further research” in 1997 and no change to this question was made for the 2010 US Census cycle (OMB 1997: 9).
religious affiliation. These are used in tandem with the ethnicity question in some analyses for ethnicity in Britain (e.g., the “Focus on Ethnicity and Religion” report, Dobbs et al. 2006). In comparable directive publications for the 2001 and 2011 censuses, ethnicity is said to be based on “self-defined” ethnic groups and was researched and tested “extensively” so as to be acceptable notably to mixed origin, White, and Black British and Asian British respondents (Vidler 2001; White Paper 1999). Though the question uses the term “ethnicity,” one of the purposes of the data is to “monitor possible racial disadvantage within minority groups” (White Paper 1999: 15, emphasis added), which suggests synonymy between understood notions of “race” and “ethnicity” on a discursive level.

As the ONS views the ethnic categories as self-defined, directive documents do not outline specifically what the available ethnic categories mean, either to those bodies collecting and using the data or for whom the specified categories are intended. However, there are detailed recoding documents that ONS statisticians use to “correct” ethnic selections, in cases where more than one ethnicity is selected, where there is an apparent incongruence between marked and written-in responses, or other responses deemed as “nonsense” (ONS 2003, 2015; White Paper 2003). As such, this indicates a contradiction, as there are instances where responses can be altered from the way respondents originally identified themselves and family members. The ONS does operate with a fairly rigid construction of racialisation, which influences which responses are flagged for recoding. If one falls outside of the categories offered, they are relegated to alternative categories accepted by the state.

Racialised Categories

Not only do the two censuses differ in their general terminologies for racialised differences, but the options given for self-identification are also specific for each nation. In England and Wales, the 2001 census form offers the following ethnic options: “White,” “Mixed,” “Asian or Asian British,” “Black or Black British,” and
“Chinese or other ethnic group” (Bradford 2006: 8). The ONS listed their five ethnic categories on the census form, and further specified subgroups for each ethnic option. There is some variation to the level of differentiation within these subgroups: country (e.g., “Irish”), multi-country/regional (e.g., “British” or “Caribbean”), and continental (e.g., “African”). “Colour” (phenotype) is not used as a sole marker of ethnic differentiation on the 2001 or 2011 British censuses, as it is not possible to select only “White” or “Black.” Where colour is used as an overall category on the census, there are subcategories to qualify the ethnic descriptor, which is distinct from the US census that does not always do so. Although official census forms in Britain do not use sole colour referents to ethnicity, they are at times used as ethnic labels in the analysis reports (e.g., Bradford 2006).

Within the White, Asian, and Chinese categories, limited subcategories offer national origin identification for further specification. Additionally, there is an option for write-in responses to “Any other” ethnic background. For the Black category, the subcategory options are also present, but less specific: “Caribbean” and “African.” Superficially, “Caribbean” refers to a region of nations, while “African” is a demonym for the continent of Africa, which is also made up of many sovereign nations. For the Mixed ethnicity category, three specific options are offered: “White and Black African,” “White and Black Caribbean,” and “White and Asian”; which vary in national/continental specificity. As with the other ethnic group options, there is also a fourth option, “Any other Mixed background,” which is available for write-in responses (Bradford 2006: 8).

In 2001, the total population for England and Wales was 52,359,976. Of this, 91.2% indicated a White ethnicity, 1.3% selected from the Mixed ethnicity category, 4.9%

---

7 The England and Wales 2011 census cycle introduced changes to the wording of the broad ethnic categories, though the changes were deemed minor enough by the ONS to render the 2001 and 2011 data as “broadly comparable: (ONS 2012). The “Mixed” ethnicity category was altered to “Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups.” The subcategories retained the same wording from the 2001 census cycle. “Asian or Asian British” changed to “Asian/Asian British,” and “Chinese” was consolidated under the Asian category. “Black/African/Caribbean/Black British” replaced “Black or Black British,” with no changes to the subcategories. The “Other” ethnic group added the subcategory “Arab” alongside “Any other ethnic group.”
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indicated Asian ethnicity, 2.2% selected a Black ethnicity, and 0.4% indicated that they were from “Any other ethnic group” (Jivraj 2012; Rendall 2005). In 2011, the population rose 7.1% to 56,075,912. The White ethnicity counts increased by 1% overall to 86% of the population. Mixed ethnicity rose to 2.2% of the population, increasing 82.2%. Asian ethnicities comprised of 7.5%, reflecting a 65.4% increase. Black ethnicities represented 3.3% of the population, which rose 60.1%. Any other ethnic group numbers rose 46.4% to represent 0.6% of the population. Additionally, an Arab category was introduced in 2011, and reflected 0.4% of the England and Wales population (Jivraj 2012; White 2012).

The mixed ethnicity category, 1.3% of the total population England and Wales in 2001, totalled 671,955 people. This number rose to 1,224,400 by the 2011 census. The Mixed White and Caribbean subcategory made up 0.5% of the Mixed group in 2001, rising to 0.8% in 2011. The proportion of Mixed White and African responses was 0.2% in 2001 and 0.3% in 2011. The Mixed White and Asian subcategory was 0.4% in 2001, and rose to 0.6% in 2011. The Mixed Other group represented 0.3% of the Mixed category in 2001, increasing to 0.5% in 2011 (Jivraj 2012; Rendall 2006; White 2012).

The US racial categories are: “White,” “Black or African American,” “American Indian and Alaska Native,” “Asian,” “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander,” and “Some other race” (Jones and Bullock 2012; Jones and Smith 2001: 2). Similar to the case in Britain, some of the responses are defined by a colour (i.e., “White” or “Black”), whilst others are defined by national or regional qualifiers (e.g., “Asian Indian” or “Native Hawaiian”). Three of the groups do not have subcategories, whilst “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander” have several subcategory options. In 2000 and 2010, respondents were allowed to select up to all of fifteen responses, which included the additional subcategories, as well as written responses for American Indians and Alaska natives, “Other Asian,” “Other Pacific Islander,” and “Some other race” groups. These responses represented up to all six racial categories, if the respondents so chose to select them. During the
census analyses, the responses were coded into the six recognised larger racial categories.

The population in the United States totalled 281,421,906, according to Census 2000 (Grieco and Cassidy 2001). The One Race population was reported as 97.6% of the population, whilst the Two or More Races population made up the remaining 2.4% of the total population. Of the One Race totals, White proportions were 75.1%, Black or African American made up 12.3%, American Indian and Alaska Native were 0.9%, Asian represented 3.6%, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander were 0.1%, and Some Other Race made up 5.5% of the total population (Grieco and Cassidy 2001; Humes et al. 2011).

The Two or More Races responses had a count of 6,826,228. Of this population, the percentage of respondents that selected Two races was 93.3%. The largest groups within the Two races subcategory were White and Some Other Race (32.3% of the Two or More Races category), White and American Indian or Alaska Native (15.9%), White and Asian (12.7%), White and Black or African American (11.5%), and Black and African American and Some Other Race (6.1%). The remainder each represented under 4.0%. The proportion of Three Races responses was 6.0%, with only two reaching over 1.0% of the Two or More Races population: White, Black or African American, and American Indian and Alaska Native (1.6%) and White, Asian, and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (1.3%). The Four Races subcategory made up 0.6% of the Two or More Races category. The White, Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Asian response represented 0.2% of the Two or More Races population; the remaining combinations totalled 0.1% or less. The Five Races category represented 0.1% of the multiple responses, with a majority selecting White, Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (0.1%). Respondents who selected all six racialised categories reached a percentage that rounded to 0.0% (823 respondents) (Grieco and Cassidy 2001; Humes et al. 2011).
The 2010 US Census reported the total population as 308,745,538, which represents a 9.7% increase since Census 2000 (Jones and Bullock 2012). Of this, 97.1% of the population selected One Race (9.2% increase from 2000) and 2.9% selected Two or More Races (32.0% increase from 2000). Within the One Race responses, responses of White represented 72.4% of the total population (5.7% change from 2000). The Black or African American category represented 12.6% of the population, representing a 12.3% change from 2000. American Indian and Alaska Native responses increased 18.4% from 2000 to 0.9% of the US population. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander represented 0.2% of the total population and a 35.4% increase from 2000. The Some Other Race category comprised 6.2% of the total population, increasing 24.4% from 2000 (Humes et al. 2011; Jones and Bullock 2012).

Over nine million respondents selected more than one race in 2010 (9,009,073 responses) (Humes et al. 2011; Jones and Bullock 2012; Pew Research Center 2015). Those selecting Two Races represented 91.7% of the Two or More Races population, reflecting a 29.8% change from 2000 to 2010. White and Black were the largest group reported, making up 20.4% of the Two or More Races Population and a 133.7% increase from the 2000 census. White and Some Other Race (19.3%, -21.1% change), White and Asian (18.0%, 86.9% change), White and American Indian and Alaska Native (15.9%, 32.3% change), and Black and Some Other Race (3.5%, -24.6% change) reflect the most common combinations selected by respondents. The Three Races category represented 7.5% of the Two or More group, which reflects a 64.9 percent increase from 2000. As seen in 2000, only two subcategories reached over 1.0% in 2010: White, Black and American Indian and Alaska Native (2.6%, 105.7% change from 2000) and White, Asian, and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (1.6%, 59.7% change). Respondents selecting Four Races represented 0.6% of the Two or More population, which indicates a 50.7% increase from the previous census. The largest combination within this group was again the White, Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Asian subcategory (0.2%, 78.2% change from 2000). The remaining combinations remained under 0.1%, as in Census 2000. The Five Races subcategory comprised 0.1% of the Two
or More population, with a count that reflected a -0.2% decrease from 2000. White, Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander was the largest combination within this subcategory and represented 0.1% (-0.1% change from 2000). The other percentages of possible combinations for Five races rounded to 0.0%. The same is the case for the Six Race subcategory, which was recorded as 0.0% (792 respondents). That population count represents a decrease of 3.8% from 2000 (Humes et al. 2011; Jones and Bullock 2012).

The US Census has refrained from adding a mixed race category with selected subcategories to its race question, as was done in Britain. Instead, in 2000 the Bureau allowed for respondents to select more than one racialised category for the first time in its census history. Those who were coded into more than one racial category were referred to in analyses as the “Two or more races” population, or as those who identified as “More than one race” (Jones and Smith 2001: 1, 2). In effect, by disallowing a “catch all” category (or categories, as in the British case), the OMB avoided creating another official racialised category alongside the existing ones. As discussed above, although multiple responses were allowed for “race,” mixed or multiple (Hispanic/Latino) “ethnicity” was not accommodated on the 2000 census form. The question was phrased as a “Yes” or “No” question, which meant that respondents had to choose that they were either of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity or were not of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.

An issue that has arisen in both nations, to varying extents, is the question of how respondents understand “race”/“ethnicity,” and subsequently make decisions on the category or categories they select on the census form. When ethnicity questions were originally introduced on the British census during the 1991 cycle, the ONS found unexpected responses for some of the ethnic categories. Richard Berthoud (1998) outlines that the results in 1991 revealed a conceptual dilemma as to whether the ethnicity question was meant to capture the concepts of ancestry or heritage, or whether it was to capture notions of identity and belonging. An example of this was seen when comparing the responses for Black ethnicity to the other ethnic categories. For example, responses for the Asian category tended to
suggest that respondents understood their “ethnicity” to be related to their ancestral country or countries of origin. In contrast, responses for the Black category tended to align with a sense of national identity rather than ancestral heritage, particularly for those of Caribbean ancestry. Consequently, there were significant responses of “Black British” written in the Black Other category rather than using the provided Black Caribbean (or Black African, in rare instances) option to indicate familial region of origin. Changes to the subsequent census allowed for “Black or Black British” or “Asian and Asian British” wording in the revised main ethnicity categories to help clear up the identified ambiguities found in the 1991 census responses (Berthoud 1998). Follow up research on the US census has identified comparable divergence between racialised ancestry and notions of personal or shared identity (Pew Research Center 2015; Song 2003). For example, a majority of respondents (61%) that have more than one racialised background indicated that they do not consider themselves to “be” (identify as) mixed race (Pew Research Center 2015). As a reason for this, the respondents indicated that they are viewed as being of one race by the general public; subsequently their sense of personal and/or shared identity is different from their ancestral racialisation. Thus, notions of identity are reflected upon in census responses as more personally significant than ancestry, further illuminating the fluidity and complexity of understanding of racialised categories. In both nations, the census bodies attempt to focus on what they likely consider an objective measurement of “race” and/or “ethnicity.” Though as the practical outcomes indicate, racialisation is a subjective and shifting concept that may vary from person to person (Berthoud 1988; Pew Research Center 2015; Song 2003; Waters 1990).

In both the United States and Britain, there is little consistency with what constitutes a “race” or an “ethnicity.” Nevertheless, the way that the two government agencies describe race and ethnicity in these classification questions helps to illuminate the general understanding and attitudes of race and ethnicity of each state. The census in Britain offers considerably fewer racialised options than the US census. The ONS approach to assess and broaden racialised categories suggests an acutely “reactionary” response to identifying populations. Although
there is great diversity in Britain (particularly in urban centres), this is not reflected in
the options of the ethnicity question. The ONS determines official representation, in
part, through relative population size (ONS 2012). As the census results reveal
comparable written responses, they consider adding or revising the ethnicity
options. Indeed, the Mixed ethnicity group was developed largely as a response to
the written responses from the 1991 census. However, smaller populations often
are relegated to “Other” ethnicities. Consequently, they are potentially obscured in
the census data as they are likely to describe their ethnic affinities in multiple ways.
They are not as easily categorised as the larger populations with official categories,
and thus smaller populations remain unrepresented. This greatly impacts the ways
that race is constructed, both officially and throughout society. Historically, the US
census has approached categorisation similarly, in that it has responded to salient
immigration shifts over time. However, within the most recent cycles, the racialised
categories have remained relatively stable. As will be discussed further in Chapters
Five and Six, the change to allow more than one racialised option for respondents
was largely impacted by political pressure from non-governmental organisations
This indicates that explicit political projects are potentially significantly influential in
contemporary US racialisation processes alongside the goals for “accurate”
racialised representation.

The US and British governments deviate from each other even more, in their
conceptions and allowances, when considering mixed racialisation. In Britain, the
government allowed for a “Mixed” category, which was further divided into four
subcategories. Three of the subcategories included “White” and one of the minority
ethnic categories. The “Black or Black British” category was broken down to its
two main subcategories (the multinational/regional “Black Caribbean” and the
continental “Black African”), whilst “Asian” was retained at the continental
description level. The “Any other Mixed background” allowed write-in responses.
Any response that included two different ethnicity backgrounds was counted as
part of the Mixed group, including ethnicities that comprised of two subcategories
from one main ethnic category (e.g., “White British and White Irish”).
In the United States, the term “mixed” is not used either on the census form or in reports, and the population that described itself with more than one racial category—after coding—was referred to as the “Two or more” population. As a result of the coding process, respondents were only considered to be of two or more races when their selections could be coded as such. For example, a person who selected “White” and “Samoan” would be coded as “White” and “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander,” and thus would be reported as part of the “Two or more” population. However, a person who selected “Korean” and “Vietnamese” would be coded as “Asian” and “Asian,” and therefore would not be considered to be part of the population that reported more than one race.

**MIXED RACE: A NEW CATEGORY?**

These differences are important when considering how the data for people racialised as mixed were analysed in both countries. US “ethnicity” (Hispanic/Latino) aside, more than one race was regarded as a multiplicity of identities in the US, comprised of as many races as a respondent selected (Jones and Bullock 2012; Jones and Smith 2001). The language used to discuss this population was consistent with this; the group was not spoken about as one homogeneous group, but rather as the population that responded as being more than one race. For example, in analyses, the racial data was “divided into two broad categories: the race alone population and the Two or more races population” (Jones and Bullock 2012: 3; Jones and Smith 2001: 2, emphases in original). The data are reported both in the broad category of “Two or more races,” as well as in subcategories specifying the number of races selected (i.e., “Two races,” up to “Six races”). However, as there were relatively few respondents who chose more than two races in the “Two or more” group (approximately 7% of the “Two or more” population), the group is frequently discussed in terms of the two broad categories mentioned above.

For British analyses, those respondents who were of more than one category were frequently categorised into one “Mixed” group. “Mixed” was often described as a
single identity, opposed to multiple or fluid racialised identities that can potentially include more than the options offered. Examples in language include, “…people who have a Mixed ethnic identity,” and “This article profiles the four Mixed ethnic groups identified in the 2001 Census” (Bradford 2006: 3, emphases added).

Throughout the census reports that focused on Mixed ethnicity, the four specific Mixed groups (including “Other Mixed”) are spoken about mostly as separate and distinct groups, and their reported characteristics are presented as such. In the more general articles on the mixed population in the census results, “Mixed ethnic” was used more frequently in the general sense, as well as the term “Mixed race.” The introduction of “Mixed race” goes undefined by the government reports; however, it is used as an apparent synonym to “Mixed ethnicity.” An example of this usage is from the Victims of Crime summary in the “Focus on Ethnicity and Identity” article, where the term “mixed race” is used numerous times to refer to “people,” “background(s),” and “households”; including an instance in the topic subtitle (Rendall 2005: 14). The term “Mixed ethnic(ity)” is not used in this section of the article, however when “Mixed race” is compared to other groups, the other groups are specified to be “ethnic”—and not “racial”—groups. This suggests that the ONS conceptualises “ethnicity” as racialised terminology, rather than distinguishing between the two concepts in a meaningful way.

Another difference is the way that Britain and the USA describe mixed race populations with regard to racialised majority/minority status. In British reports, the Mixed ethnic groups are labelled and constructed as new ethnic minorities that have only recently emerged within the last fifty years (Bradford 2006). As overviewed in the first and second chapters of the thesis, racialised mixedness has been occurring for centuries in both Britain and the United States. In summary reports, “Mixed ethnicity” is regarded as non-White, and is therefore considered to be a minority ethnic population (Bradford 2006; Rendall 2005). An example of such wording can be found in the “Focus on Ethnicity and Identity” article, where it is written, “Fifteen per cent of the non-White population were from the Mixed ethnic group” (Rendall 2005: 1). Latent in this statement is the negating of the White ethnicities of the majority of the Mixed ethnic groups, as the three main groups as
defined by the ONS all specify a partial White racialisation (e.g., “White and Black Caribbean”). For the purposes of the British government, a racialised minority identity classifies Mixed ethnic respondents as minorities, which suggests a form of hypodescentent understanding of racialisation. It is unclear whether any exceptions are made in the cases of the write in responses for the Other Mixed groups, where respondents indicated two White ethnicities (e.g., White British and White Irish). For the White Irish generally, even though they are considered an ethnic minority, they are also classified as White in the “Focus on Ethnicity and Identity” report (Rendall 2005), and thus aggregated into the White ethnic majority. The Other Mixed group is not spoken about in depth in this report, where the main racialised groups are compared and contrasted.

A different approach is taken by the US Census Bureau in the way it describes the respondents of the Two or more racial category. The reports for the US do not use majority or minority terminology to qualify their racialised categories, as is done in the British documents. In the case for both the Two or More analyses and the analyses of the six racial categories, there is discussion of both the racial group “alone” and the racial group “in combination” (Jones and Bullock 2012; Jones and Smith 2001; McKinnon 2001). For the purposes of the analyses, respondents are considered to be each of their racialised responses, in contrast to a completely new and separate racialised group. Although the data are at times compared between the race alone and the race in combination categories, each major racial category can also be defined as the race “alone or in combination” group, which combines both sets of data. For example, in the article that overviews the Black population, it explains, “[A] way to define the Black population is to combine those respondents who reported only Black with those who reported Black as well as one or more other races. [...] Another way to think of the Black alone or in combination population is the total number of people who identified entirely or partially as Black” (McKinnon 2001: 2, emphasis in original). A slight change in wording for the 2010 report says, “...total number of people who reported Black, whether or not they reported any other races” (Rastogi et al. 2011: 3). The implication of racialisation being a summation of parts from the 2000 report was changed to speak only about...
how race was “reported”; a distancing from an official position based on racialised quantum. Nonetheless, the analyses were carried out in the same way for both census cycles. The US approach reflects a type of essentialising that constructs the Black population, as well as the others, as homogenisable by way of the same selected racialised category.

Considering these two approaches, the two governments state different goals for their comparisons of mixed race data with the other racialised groups categorised within each nation. This shows an official assumption of racialised difference among the different groups, as the mere counting by race implies that there is something to count in the first place (Nobles 2000, 2002). In the case of the Mixed ethnicity data for Britain, the ONS states that one of their key issues of interest examines “…the extent to which [the Mixed ethnic groups] are more similar to the White group, or to the ethnic minority groups, from which they are drawn” (Bradford 2006: 3). This particular wording appears to suggest a latent sense of binary essentialism in the government-defined ethnic categories, while at the same time, there is inconsistency with this assumption and the labelling of the groups as “new ethnicities.” If the government understands the Mixed groups as new, it would not necessarily result that the Mixed ethnic groups would either show similarities to the White majority group or to their specific or collective racialised minority groups. Indeed, the census organisation’s analyses of the census data do not consistently show any similarities to one group over the other for any of the Mixed ethnicity groups, calling into question this assumptive approach.

The Two or more analyses in the United States do not use language that stresses the comparisons between other racial groups accounted for on Census 2000. The reports on race are described as being part of a series of reports that provide “portraits” of each racialised group, with regard to population, national distribution, and housing data collected during the census cycle (Jones and Smith 2001; McKinnon 2001). The reports describe the data for each racialised group (both alone and in combination, as well as a specific report for the Two or more races population) without comparing and contrasting specific racial categories. The Two
or more races group does compare data between the general Two or more group and the general race alone groups, however the report refrains from doing so on a specific racialised group level. The reports also analyse data for race in conjunction with the data collected for Hispanic ethnicity. This is done by comparing the racialised group with no Hispanicity with the racialised group with Hispanicity. This is done to compare and contrast ethnicity within the racial classifications; however, the data is still considered to be for the same racialised group.

Demographic Information
The census reports for both the United States and Britain describe demographic information on their enumerated racialised populations. The information and discourses used to describe the populations reveal additional aspects about the underpinning ideologies that construct official mixed race identities. Generally speaking, the demographic information for the United States and Britain are relatively similar for the age profile and regions of concentration for mixed race groups. However, there are some differences in how the information is presented in the census reports.

The mixed race groups have a young age profile in both national contexts, which is highlighted in both nations’ census reports. However, the British reports highlighted this fact far more strongly than the US reports. In “The Two or More Races Population” article from 2000, the age distribution is mentioned at the end of the report, right before the standard information on Census 2000 that is included on all reports is presented (Jones and Smith 2001). This is done in two brief paragraphs, whereas the youth of the Mixed ethnic group in Britain received a full section in “Who are the ‘Mixed’ Ethnic Group?” Within these analyses, the ages of respondents are reported by Mixed ethnic subcategory, providing insight into the differences in age spread among the group in its entirety. In addition to the section dedicated to the Mixed ethnic age profile, these data are mentioned in the analyses throughout the report in explanations of other characteristics found from the census data (Bradford 2006). The focus given by each state to the age of the population indicates the relative importance each gives to the overall construction of
mixedness. In Britain, the age profile is a significant part of the “story” for the “emergent” Mixed ethnic population. In contrast, in the United States, although mixed race is also considered an emergent population, the census reports rely more on other data to describe the populations.

In the United States, those respondents who reported Two or more races had a higher percentage of being under the age of eighteen than those who responded as belonging to one race (Jones and Bullock 2012; Jones and Smith 2001). Forty-two percent of the respondents who reported more than one race were seventeen or younger, in contrast to a quarter of respondents of one race, and a comparable pattern remains when Hispanicity data are considered (Jones and Smith 2001). In Britain, census reports state that the Mixed ethnic group had the youngest age profile for any ethnic group in 2001 (Bradford 2006). Somewhat higher than in the US, fifty percent of the group were under sixteen years of age (Bradford 2006).

While the highlighting of the young age profile is important in shedding light on racial and ethnic trends in both countries, this comes at the expense of the data analysis of older mixed race populations. The stress on the “new” and “young” functions to deny that mixed race populations have been around for many generations (Ifekwunigwe 1999; Mahtani 2014; Parker and Song 2001; R. Spencer 2011, 2014). This is especially the case in the United States, where reports indicate that this was the first time respondents could be designated as more than one race, however throughout US census history, various mixed race categories have been used to capture racial mixture at different points in time.

The other main type of demographic information examined in the British and US census reports was regional assessment, or where those of mixed race tended to live within each country, which uses racialised geography to further construct mixedness. As the geographic sizes of Britain and the United States differ greatly, the focuses of each country are particular to each national context. The US reports on states and large regional levels, whereas Britain focuses on smaller regions and large urban centres. For Britain, the census reports say that during the 2001 census cycle, nearly half of those with Mixed ethnicity lived in the South East region of
England, with a third of this population living in London (Bradford 2006). However, of all of the main minority ethnic groups recognised by the British government officials, Mixed ethnic groups were the least likely to live in London based on proportion percentages, as the other groups are more concentrated in the capital city (Bradford 2006). When considering age data, Mixed ethnic children are less likely to live in London than their adult counterparts (Bradford 2006). Three possible factors are given to explain these data. One is that “inter-ethnic” couples might be more mobile geographically than other ethnic groups, which may account for their being more likely to leave London to raise their families. The second is that Mixed ethnic adults are drawn to a multi-ethnic centre, such as London, and thus relocate there when they leave their families. The final reason given is that individuals from minority ethnic groups are more likely to form partnerships with White individuals when they live outside of London, due to the fewer numbers of ethnic minorities residing outside of the capital (Bradford 2006). No data are given to corroborate these assumptive claims. Furthermore, there are other plausible reasons that may not be ascertainable by census methodologies as to why the data point to these trends. Though these may be factors contributing to the concentrations of Mixed ethnic respondents inside and outside of London, it seems as though when looking at the data, the proportions (opposed to raw numbers) of the different subcategories might suggest that perhaps inter-ethnic partnerships are simply becoming more common and more normalised across the country rather than just being a feature of the multi-ethnic centre of London. White and Black Caribbean and White and Asian groups were the least likely to live in London, of the four Mixed groups. This coincides with data that shows that nearly forty percent of Black Caribbean respondents lived outside of London, as well as nearly half of the Bangladeshi population (Bradford 2006).

The US reports are largely focused on geographic data, which suggests that this information is an important output for the census exercise, particularly for the redistricting, representation, and funding goals outlined by the OMB (Jones and Bullock 2012; Jones and Smith 2001). As the country is much larger and has a different socioeconomic geography than Britain, the reports do not focus on one
urban centre, such as the capital—the District of Columbia—or a comparable global city, such as New York City or Los Angeles. Instead, the US reports focus on the four regions that comprise the entire country (West, South, Northeast, and Midwest), as well as individual states, counties, and cities that have significant concentrations of the Two or more population. In contrast to Britain, the region with the largest concentration of respondents with Two or more racial identities is not the one which includes the national capital city or a high concentration of the largest cities, but rather the West. Forty percent of the Two or more population lived in the West, which includes the non-contiguous states of Alaska and Hawaii. This is followed by twenty-seven percent in the South (which includes the District of Columbia), eighteen percent in the Northeast, and fifteen percent in the Midwest (Jones and Smith 2001). The West region had both the highest proportions and highest raw numbers of census respondents who reported more than one race in the country. The US reports consider both types of numerical data, whereas the British reports focused on proportional data and hypothesis.

Areas of Need
Both national census organisations state that the main reasons for conducting the decennial exercise is for the purposes of gathering information on the demographics of the people in the nation, their locations, and their areas of need. The USA and British census reports cover the information on the first two in substantial depth in the various publications made available to the general population. However, the two nations differ in the accessibility of information for the third reason: areas of need for specific demographic populations. This is especially true for mixed race individuals, who were acknowledged for the first time in recent history for the United States in 2000, and for the first time in the British context in 2001.

The British publications provide multiple analyses of the census data in order to describe the needs of the different Mixed ethnic populations acknowledged in the 2001 census cycle. Primarily, the reports stress the construction that the Mixed ethnic population is new, young, and relatively unknown (Bradford 2006; Rendall
The British government acknowledges a need to understand this particular population in order to serve it better now and in the future. The racialised ideology of the British government is displayed in the assumptions that the Mixed groups would be either more like “the White group, or [like] the ethnic minority groups, from which they are drawn” (Bradford 2006: 3). However, the analyses are less straightforward, and the Mixed ethnic groups, overall, display unique characteristics that are not strictly attributable to either group of origin.

About two-thirds of a million people identified into one of the Mixed ethnicity categories in the whole of the United Kingdom in 2001. For England and Wales, the largest Mixed ethnic group was the Mixed White and Black Caribbean ethnic group, with 237,000 people (Bradford 2006). As the largest group, they are also the youngest ethnic group in Britain, with over half under the ages of 16 years of age (58%). This group was the most likely of all the Mixed ethnicities to have been born inside the United Kingdom (all but 6%), and therefore it follows that the majority of Mixed White and Black Caribbean people in Britain are considered to be British citizens, and with higher frequency than with the other Mixed ethnic groups. As British citizens, they will be entitled to the same rights and support from the British government that other British nationals would be entitled to. In a country where historically, citizenship has been a salient issue for civil rights purposes, this is important when considering how the government acknowledges, regards, and responds to the needs that arise for this specific population (Bhattacharyya et al. 2002; Sussman 2014)

Some detail is spent in the “Who are the ‘Mixed’ Ethnic Group?” publication specifically on the Mixed White and Black Caribbean ethnic group, with regard to education and economic activity; the two main areas of indicated need from the census results. Focusing on these type of indicators presents correlation between homogenised ethnicity and social indicators, which functions to fix constructions of mixedness. The report focuses on what could be considered the “underperforming” of Mixed White and Black Caribbean group in education. This group was the least likely to have a higher qualification for all of the Mixed ethnic group, as well as
falling lower than the general population proportions. The report further explains that this group is also the most likely to have no qualifications at all. In this instance, they were under the general population, but only by four percentage points (Bradford 2006). For GCSE grades, the Mixed White and Black Caribbean group again fell the lowest in achievement, when compared to the other Mixed ethnic groups.

In the areas of employment and economic activity, both Mixed White and Black Caribbean men and women had the highest rates of economic activity among the Mixed ethnic groups overall. When broken down further, young Mixed White and Black Caribbean men and women (16-24) maintained the highest rates of economic activity. However, for older adults (25-64 for men and 25-59 for women), their relative rates of economic activity lessen in comparison to the other Mixed groups. Older Mixed White and Asian men and women have the highest economic activity rates; in comparison, Mixed White and Black Caribbean men are second after the top group and women are third out of the four groups (Bradford 2006). Younger Mixed White and Asian men and women had the lowest rates of economic activity, which was attributed to high proportions of this group in full-time education. Following full-time education, the state constructs that this group is better poised to be economically active, when considering the data for the older men and women. Using the same logic, it follows that young Mixed White and Black Caribbean adults are not in full-time education to the same proportions, and may be hindered by this later in their careers, as the overall economic activity is surpassed as the population gets older. Looking at the unemployment data further supports this; although the Mixed White and Black Caribbean group is the most economically active overall, they are the most likely to be unemployed for both men and women (Bradford 2006). The unemployment rates of the Mixed groups were generally higher than the White and other minority ethnic groups; this was the case for the Mixed White and Black Caribbean group. Of the unemployed, men were more likely to be unemployed than women, and the younger more so than the older; which means that in particular, young Mixed White and Black Caribbean males are constructed
as showing the greatest need in this area, when considering the census data collectively.

The other area of need that was illuminated in the government reports was that in the area of crime. Mixed ethnic groups in England and Wales were the most likely to be victims of personal or household crime and violence, when compared to other ethnic groups (Rendall 2005). Nearly half of Mixed ethnic adults had been victims of crime within the previous twelve months, in comparison to the next likely group, which was just under a third of Asians. A perhaps telling observation is that despite the crime statistics that Mixed ethnic groups are far more likely to experience crime and violence than other groups proportionally, all the other minority ethnic groups were proportionally more worried about violent crime than the Mixed ethnic group, which ends up experiencing most of it (Rendall 2005).

The needs of the other specific Mixed ethnic groups are not as well highlighted as those for the Mixed White and Black Caribbean group, when considering all of the census results reported in the available articles. Although the reporting indicated that Mixed White and Black Africans were the third least likely of the four Mixed groups to hold a higher qualification, they are only five percentage points down from the Other Mixed group, which is the mostly likely group to hold a higher qualification. The gap between the Mixed White and Black African and the Mixed White and Black Caribbean groups is twelve percent, which is a much more substantial gap. A similar situation is found in the proportions of Mixed White and Black Africans with no qualifications; although they are the second most likely to have no qualification for the four Mixed groups, they are closer than the lowest group (Other Mixed) than the highest (Mixed White and Black Caribbean), and the gap is fairly substantial between the first and second groups. At times, the Mixed White and Black African group is combined with the Mixed White and Black Caribbean group, when speaking about educational attainment. The two groups were the least likely to achieve five or more GCSE A*-C grades of the four Mixed groups. Both were lower than their White peers, however higher than their Black African and Black Caribbean peers, respectively (Bradford 2006). Educational
attainment for Mixed White and Black African school students appears to be another area of illuminated need from the census reports.

The Mixed White and Asian and Other Mixed groups are often reported as high attainers in the education and employment analyses (Bradford 2006). They are the most likely groups to have a higher qualification, and the least likely to have no qualification. In comparisons with the other Mixed ethnic groups, minority ethnic groups, White ethnic groups, and the general populations, they often have higher levels of attainment. The census reports stress when the Mixed groups perform higher than the non-White group in their racialised group label, and for the case of the Mixed White and Asian group, this is typically the case when compared to the Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups. They are usually similar to the Indian groups. This group exceeds the White British group for GCSE grades. The Other Mixed group is not compared to any racialised groups, as the group is ethnically very heterogeneous, however they do usually perform better than other racialised minority groups, as well. There are therefore minimal areas of need illuminated for these two specific Mixed groups in the various British census reports.

The information that one is able to glean from the United States Census reports is less detailed than that offered in the British reports, especially for the Two or more racial group. In the report specifically dedicated to analysing the racial groups, the Office of Management and Budget identified fifty-seven possible combinations of two-six races\(^8\) (Grieco and Cassidy 2001; Jones and Bullock 2012). Of these, the OMB identified only four combinations for the purposes of civil rights monitoring

\[\text{six} \choose \text{two} + \text{six} \choose \text{three} + \text{six} \choose \text{four} + \text{six} \choose \text{five} + \text{six} \choose \text{six} = 15 + 20 + 15 + 6 + 1 = 57.\]

\(^8\) The fifty-seven possible combinations cited by the OMB reflect the variety of selections of two or more racial categories from the six listed (including “Some other race”). The subcategories listed under the “Asian” and “Pacific Islander” combinations are counted as the respective main racial category (Grieco and Cassidy 2001; Jones and Bullock 2012).

I provide the following algebraic equation for calculating combinations (cf. Hayak et al. 2005), which serves to illustrate and verify the OMB’s number:

The shorthand \(\binom{n}{r}\) denotes the formula for the number of combinations of \(r\) choices (racial categories) from \(n\) options (six): \(n! / r! (n-r)!\). The total number of Two or more racial combinations is calculated as \(\binom{6}{2} + \binom{6}{3} + \binom{6}{4} + \binom{6}{5} + \binom{6}{6} = 15 + 20 + 15 + 6 + 1 = 57.\)
and enforcement, to add to the other five single race categories. The four identified were “White and American Indian and Alaska Native,” “White and Asian,” “White and Black or African American,” and “Black or African American and American Indian and Alaska Native” (Grieco and Cassidy 2001: 5, emphases in original). These were the four largest combinations that were focused upon in research undertaken by the OMB, as well as the four largest groups overall, when the “Some other race” combinations are excluded (Grieco and Cassidy 2001).

Even though the OMB does identify the four racialised combination categories for the purpose of monitoring and enforcement, the report proceeds to analyse the racial data on the “alone or in combination” level. This means that the numbers and data are provided as the number of responses for each racial category, opposed to the number of respondents. Therefore, a respondent who chose both White and Black or African American races would be counted once in the “White alone or in combination” and once in the “Black or African American alone or in combination” group. This method enables the OMB to discuss the singular race groups on individual levels; however, it obscures the data that is particular to specific racial combinations selected by respondents. This makes it more difficult to identify the specific needs of these groups for which the OMB aims to monitor and enforce civil rights, as well as the other fifty-three combinations of races that are not officially recognised for the purposes of monitoring.

The other information that the US reports gives in detail about the Two or more population is the geographic concentrations of those who responded with more than one race. Of all the geographic data, the four states of California, Hawaii, New York, and Washington were in the top ten states for both number and proportion of the Two or more races population (Jones and Smith 2001). There is not much detail into the needs of these locations, however perhaps the locations of the Two or more population may serve as a starting point for further investigation into the needs of this racial group on regional levels.
CONCLUSION

Although on the surface, the census may seem similar in the United States and Britain, the differences emerge quickly in the analyses of the data reports that the governments make available for various members of the general public. While the United States had great public support and advocacy from mixed race individuals and organisations who campaigned for a mixed race option on the 2000 census, and the US government acknowledged the importance in conceding to this change (on their terms), the official analyses are not detailed for the new Two or more population about which they claimed they were interested in finding out more. There is a much greater focus on the “race alone” groups than the Two or more races groups, and within the Two or more races groups, there is little focus on the different combinations represented by this larger category. Officially, the OMB does not acknowledge mixedness through the creation of a new category. This is reflective of the prevailing focus on separate and distinct racialised categories over the possibility of racialised mixture. As there remains no “mixed” category on the US census, reporting did not overtly reinforce commonalities or highlight distinctions among mixed race populations. Rather, mixedness is constructed as a summation of racialised categories and analysed primarily alongside the singular racialised groups. By adopting this strategy, the OMB does not create and reify new racialised categories. Instead, the strategy overlooks potential trends for specific racialised mixes and reifies assumptions of hypodescent through analysing racialised categories “alone or in combination.”

The data that is available in the US reports are largely geographical, and do not go into detail about the specific areas of need and concern for which the question was intended. The approach taken by the US Census Bureau allows for more generalisable data opposed to specific analyses of the Two or more population. The way that the analyses view mixed race is not as a cohesive group, but rather as a group that would display elements of any of the races one identifies with, as well as perhaps similarities with others who also identify into more than one racial category. With this approach, there is little that the census could illuminate about specific groups, as the respondents are rarely examined at the level of specific
racial combinations. For the purposes of civil rights monitoring and enforcement, four of the fifty-seven Two or more combinations were chosen to include along with the other five main racial categories, however no further data is analysed in the census reports provided to indicate the needed direction of the evaluations and monitoring that arose from the census data.

The analysts of the British Mixed ethnic data approach the mixed race category in a different way from the United States. There was not the same strong political effort from individuals and organisations leading up to the 2001 census to allow for a mixed race category on the census questionnaire. The government’s consultation process primarily led them to add a Mixed ethnic category, comprised of four subgroups of Mixed ethnicity, based on the likely ethnic mixes present in Britain from the 1950s. Since the Mixed ethnic population was described as a group, the British government was able to use it as a variable and compare the data for the Mixed ethnic group with the other ethnic groups, as well as within the category on the subgroup level. The British strategy suggests an acknowledgement of the ways different groups are racialised in Britain, including potentially diverse implications within a general “Mixed” category. However, a tension remains in that by rigidly constructing mixedness into specific combinations of backgrounds and treating them as largely separate, the ONS does not only describe phenomena, but acts to legitimate and reify these socially constructed groups that they have created. The data reports are subsequently more detailed for the Mixed ethnic groups in Britain than they are for the Two or more population in the United States. In the analyses, different trends were identified for the different Mixed ethnicities, which led to areas of need being illuminated during the course of this analysis of content and discourse. Not all of the Mixed ethnic groups are attaining the same levels of education and economic activity. While Mixed White and Asian and Other Mixed groups are performing at levels that are comparable or exceeding the general population, the Mixed White and Black African and the Mixed White and Black Caribbean groups are not doing as well comparatively, and are showing areas of potential need and government assistance. The British government approached the Mixed ethnicity categories as a sum of their racialised parts, so-to-speak; however,
the data was not as straightforward in reality. The analyses have acknowledged that the findings did not support this original assumption and the observed trends—opposed to these assumptions—should then be used to support Mixed ethnic communities in the future.

The main findings in these analyses highlight the overall distinct ways that the US and Britain use discursive practices to conceptualise mixed race. The censuses in the US and Britain articulate constructions of mixed race that subsequently shape the ways that the rest of each nation's institutions and population understand, accept, and/or contest mixed race. The particular enumeration processes in each nation creates and defines categories. Racialisation further happens through the official discourse that they produce. The mixed race categories are not mere descriptions of data, but are complex constructions carried out by the state for the purposes of producing a racialised narrative of the population. Mixed race constructions are fraught with social meanings and consequences, which are then provided as a framework through which individuals are allowed to categorise and be officially recognised by the state.

In the following two chapters, I will analyse the ways that meso-level racial projects can be used to understand racial formation processes. Using mixed race organisations as meso-level racial projects, I will explore the mechanism that they use to construct mixed race, as well as the interactions that they have with macro-level racial projects.
Chapter Five: Macro-Level and Meso-Level Interactions

**CHAPTER OVERVIEW**

Chapter Four examined the censuses in the United States and Britain *vis-à-vis* the mixed race questions introduced in 2000 and 2001, respectively. I explored how census organisations operate as structural racial projects. They operate through the racialising practices of determining racialised categorisation and the output of census reports, which further racialise and construct mixed race at the macro-level. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) in Britain explicitly created four new mixed race categories, which acknowledge the concept of mixed race at the official level, albeit limited to specific racialised backgrounds. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) adopted a different approach, which allowed for the selection of more than one racialised category. Although the OMB is able to capture a greater diversity of racialised mixedness, they stop short of officially constructing mixed race as its own racialised category with potential social implications through having more than one racialised background.

Macro-level racial projects are one of two types of social structures with collective influence. As I discussed in Chapter Two, contemporary social research tends to focus on macro-level structural analyses or on micro-level analyses of individuals. This leaves the middle-ground interaction, or relational analyses, relatively overlooked. (Faist 2010; Fine 2012). As with the macro-level, meso-level social interactions constitute an important part of the dynamics of collective influence. It is here where I turn my research focus in the present and next chapters.

Social interactions in relational groups constitute distinct types of intermediate structures at the meso-level. Focusing only on macro- and micro-levels and their interactions renders unclear the social significance of the socio-historical and geopolitical spaces between them (Faist 2010). For racial formation theory, this leaves a wide variety of meso-level groups and institutions outside of the scope of investigations. The result of omitting meso-level organisations means that
racialisation processes at the relational level remain overlooked, or are subsumed by macro-level or micro-level conceptualisation that is not satisfactorily specific towards meso-level social dynamics. I argue that including meso-level racial projects in racial formation theory will lead to a more comprehensive understanding of racialised dynamics.

Examining meso-levels through a racial formation theoretical framework shifts focus to the roles of relational interactions in racialisation processes. Meso-level analyses examine the social ties created and maintained within a collectivity, and the ways that these types of interactions function within and across racialised collectivities. Interactional-level focus also improves understanding about how collective social levels operate, as focused investigations at the meso-level can identify racialisation phenomena that is unique from structural dynamics. Studying the interactions between meso-level and macro-level racial projects identifies the functions and formulations of relative power and how they shape racialised interactions and constructions. Meso-level investigations reveal how relational and interactional racialisations systematically participate in racialisation processes, emerging and creating meaning that then spreads throughout all societal structures.

In this chapter, I aim to explore racialisation practices that occur both in and through meso-level racial projects. Guided by my research question, *How do macro-level and meso-level organisations interact in the United States and Britain in order to form constructions of mixed race?*, I will begin by exploring the concept of a meso-level project and analysing how they function in the United States and Britain. Following the work of Gary Alan Fine (2012), I will briefly outline six mechanisms that mixed race organisations use in their constructions of mixed race that I identified through the course of my research. These are mechanisms of: social identity, social capital, collective action, idioculture, external networks, and civil society. Following this outline, I will further examine collective action, external networks, and civil society, which are the three mechanisms through which mixed race organisations interact externally with other organisational entities. The remaining three are intragroup strategies, which will be analysed in the following
chapter. I will conclude the chapter by analysing the interactions of meso-level and macro-level racial projects in Britain and the United States. I will examine the types of interactions macro-level and meso-level racial projects have with each other that lead to shifts in racial formation. Informed by the Foucauldian governmentality framework, I will explore how macro-level power is used to both encourage and restrict meso-level groups. I argue that the differing levels of power and influence of macro- and meso-level projects are particularly salient factors that drive their interactions. The trajectories of racialised mixedness in the US and Britain are shaped through the particular mechanisms each macro-level institution utilises to manage governance.

**Meso-Level Projects in Racial Formation Theory**

As overviewed in Chapter Two, racial formation theory suggests that racial projects, at both macro- and micro-levels in society, shape the way that racial categories are “created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed” (Omi and Winant 1994: 55). This goes on to affect the order and governance of society (Goldberg 2002; Omi and Winant 1986, 1994, 2002). In turn, racial formation has been used to explain the ways that these two types of racial projects interact with each other. However, there remains a gap in the research of racial projects that occupy the space in between these two social levels.

I am proposing the introduction of meso-level racial projects in order to address this gap in the theory. Mixed race organisations occupy the space between macro- and micro-level racial projects; they cannot be labelled neatly as one or the other. As with micro-level projects, mixed race community organisations are comprised of individuals, however the latter reflects a group of individuals—collectivities—that are represented by the relative few in leadership. Not all the participants are equal in the structure of the group and therefore most will not have any direct influence towards the aims and goals of the group. Therefore, meso-level groups have relative power and influence in a way that individuals alone do not. However, meso-level groups do not have ruling authority or the type of political power that macro-level organisations can have. Meso-level groups typically have no direct
power to set or enforce policy at the state level. Their power comes from their ability to mobilise individuals and represent their views. In this way, they can exert greater influence over macro-level organisations than individual voices speaking alone.

Engagement between mixed race organisations and state organisations developed during the late 1990s. In the United States around the time of the 1990 census, a small number of mixed race organisations primarily from the US West coast (where the OMB has identified large population of mixedness) either formed or adjusted their strategy to lobby for the addition of a mixed race category to the census. Although some of these organisations had been active since the late 1970s or early 1980s, these did not originally form with an advocacy agenda. This came later, in response to the census (DaCosta 2007; Williams 2006). In Great Britain around this time, the same response was not obvious: mixed race groups were emerging but were not active on the same political scale as the groups I describe in the US. Following the 1991 census in Great Britain, the ONS was concerned about the number of census respondents who used the write-in option to indicate some form of racialised mixedness, and therefore could not straightforwardly be recoded for their purposes (Owen 2001). These concerns drove the inclusion of mixed race categories in the 2001 census, but mixed race groups were not consulted about these changes (Owen 2001). Mixed race groups proliferated in both nations throughout the 2000s, but unlike those in the US, groups in Great Britain were not organised around specific changes to the census. Rather, they had more varied and less explicit political advocacy agenda.

Turning to organisation theory helps to contextualise the evolution of mixed race groups and inform my analysis. More contemporary social movements have been defined by their focus on the right to identity (Cohen 1985; DaCosta 2007; Omi and Winant 1994). For mixed race groups, the struggle for the right to identity has led to contesting the social meaning of race as previously imposed by government bodies, which is important in the process of forming race. US mixed race groups’ grievances with the structure of the census meets a criterion for a movement to
emerge, set forth by Kimberly McClain DaCosta (2007) and Doug McAdam et al. (1996). The lobbying activity of these groups illustrates their expectation that they may be able to redress their grievances, meeting the second criterion. According to Kimberley McClain DaCosta:

Grievances develop in a broader cultural context, so finding out why movements emerge requires looking at more than just the visible aspects of collective action such as organisations, protests and conscious framings. It also requires that we look at the not-yet-politicized networks in which new social identities incubate.


In my analysis, I include both groups with an explicit political agenda (organisations with the primary goal of legislative campaigning) and those with implicit or no political agenda, in order to capture a range of stages of “incubation” of their constructions of mixed race social identity. Moreover, I examine these groups’ implicit agenda as well as their stated goals in order to examine more fully the motivations for these groups’ emergence (DaCosta 2007).

MESO-LEVEL MECHANISMS OF RACIALISATION

In both the United States and Britain, sociological analyses focused at the meso-level of analysis have decreased to the prioritising of micro-level and macro-level studies, and those that examine the two together (Faist 2010; Fine 2012; Johnson 2008). The result is limited understanding about social processes occurring at group and interactional levels. Since social meaning that can spread throughout all social levels can also be created at the meso-level, individual and structural approaches can also be strengthened through understanding meso-level practices.

In his article on “local sociology at the meso-level,” meso-sociologist Gary Alan Fine advocates for a renewed interest in group culture and interactional orders. He argues that social identity, social capital, collective action, idioculture, external networks, and civil society are six mechanisms through which meso-level groups can “emerge and create meanings that spread throughout a wider network” (Fine 2012: 159). I have adopted these six mechanisms as ways through which to examine mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain. They are not
meant to be discrete mechanisms; indeed, there is much overlap in the strategies through which mixed race organisations create and disseminate constructions of mixed race. I will first briefly overview each of the mechanisms, which I found mixed race organisations to use within my interview data. Following, I will begin examining in this chapter how the mechanisms of collective action, external networks, and civil society materialise in my research sites. The remaining three—social identity, social capital, and idioculture—will be analysed in Chapter Six.

Social Identity
Social identity is a mechanism whereby mixed race construction processes occur through the development of identity and relationships. Social identity can be seen as “the presentation of selves to publics” (Fine 2012: 162). Mixed race organisations function as a site for forging routine relationships and coming together under the idea of a shared identity or experience. Social identity boundaries are negotiated through racialised categorisation, social consistency, and embracing the localised history and culture of the group. All of the mixed race organisations make use of this mechanism, though for some it is a means to an end, and for others, it is their explicit end.

Social Capital
The social capital mechanism builds upon notions of community and operationalises it through the sharing of material or moral support and other forms of actualising resources. Social capital is created through the social relations within a particular group. As groups recognise common purposes, the potential for social capital increases. Therefore, what further benefits particular groups that utilise this strategy are forms of selective recruitment that are based on specific group criteria for membership. The use of this type of homophily benefits both the membership of the mixed race organisations and the organisations themselves, as the resultant social capital functions to reinforce the racialisation processes that inform it.
Collective Action

Social change rarely happens through the actions of an individual. Indeed, it is the coming together of individuals that is more likely to lead to collective action. For mixed race organisations, people within the group are vehicles for presenting mixed race constructions. In some cases, groups function as a social actor that operates through influencing the actions of their members. In other cases, they act as what Émile Durkheim (1912) called a “collective effervescence,” which mobilises impassioned, ecstatic individuals to action (Fine 2012). Mixed race organisations act as spaces for decision making, which lead to further action. Their impact can be further enhanced by strategies of interlocking groups (e.g., chapters, cell, associations, etc.) in order to intensify group identification and to increase the reach and scope of collective action.

Idioculture

If the mechanism of social identity is to create mixed race community through relationships of “selves,” idioculture uses the notions of group history and culture to create notions of a mixed race community. Idioculture is built upon learned and local culture that manifests itself as collective representations of mixedness. Connection is strengthened through racialised discursive strategies, knowledge systems, behaviours, and beliefs that are both shared by the group and are referred to in further interactions.

Extended Networks

Extended networks refer to groups that employ complex networks that reach beyond their boundaries. This strategy allows for constructions of mixed race to move from within a group and have the potential to be accessed and supported or contested throughout society. The particular constructions do not have to be accepted by all areas of society, but they gain power via authority through consistent, committed exposure. This can be done through what Fine (2012) calls “scenes.” Scenes are the gathering spaces where shared action occurs through the explicit and implicit dissemination of mixed race constructions and other racialised notions of social identity.
Civil Society

The final mechanism of mixed race construction is through the roles that mixed race organisations have in civil society. This strategy encourages “citizens to take political action and [serve] as a buffer against top-down institutional power” (Fine 2012: 170). Through this mechanism, mixed race organisations take on the role of “tiny publics” (Fine & Harrington 2004) and provide spaces for discourse and challenging macro-level entities. The sharing of perspectives leads to the shaping of political cultures, and allows for interactions with the state in ways that that cannot be achieved by individuals.

EXTERNAL MECHANISMS OF MIXED RACE CONSTRUCTION

This section will examine the ways that mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain construct mixed race as meso-level racial projects; focusing particularly on mechanisms that use the collectivity of the group as a means to interact with other organisations and institutions. Mixed race organisations are complex entities that often have simultaneous projects running alongside each other. Because of this, there is no way to analyse the six mechanisms outlined in the previous section in isolation. Subsequently, I have organised the groups into two broad, heuristic categories: those who organise with an overall aim of collective representation outside of the group boundaries (external), and those who organise primarily for the goal of creating a communal entity (intragroup). The purpose of using these categories is to highlight how the organisations talk about themselves and their purposes, and highlight the different orientations of the groups that I researched. I will examine the racialisation mechanisms of the intragroup dynamics in Chapter Six.

DS (US) and CD (US) both lead two mixed race advocacy groups. Their groups use civil society strategies to influence public policy at the macro-level as a main goal. They do this by engaging in various social or lobbying campaigns geared to promote what they see as “rights” for mixed race people. In my interview sample, each of the advocacy groups in the United States told me that they lobby national
or local governments to include mixed race categories on various official forms that ask for racial identification.

Kim M. Williams describes mixed race advocacy in the US as follows:

> Spurred by a small group of activists in the 1990s, the American system of racial classification changed recently in a conceptually bold way. With moving reference to the self-esteem of their children, along with the moral conviction that multiracial recognition could help the entire nation beyond an impasse, multiracial advocates were astonishingly successful....
>
> Williams 2005: 53.

All of the advocacy groups that I interviewed were led by parents “on behalf of” their and other mixed race children. In the United States, advocacy was relatively focused around the issue of “accurate” racial classification. The idea of racialised classification itself as a “right” is a relatively recent shift in the US. Prior to this, race was viewed largely as an objective social identifier that was merely enumerated by state bodies (DaCosta 2007). The advocates argued that individuals should have more agency around how they are categorised, and in the case of mixed race individuals, there were no acceptable options for them. Their proposed solution was to add another official category through which people could identify as being mixed race. DS (US) explained how the proposed category came about during the census campaign:

> DS: [The organisation] only uses the term “multiracial.” When we were working with the US Government in the early 1990s, they asked us to decide on one term that could be used, as they could not accommodate all terms that the interracial community uses.

As the Williams quote above suggests, a relatively small proportion of mixed race organisations in the US participate in local and national campaigning. Nonetheless, during the campaign, a number of groups representing various mixed race people had to come to agreement on one name for the new category. According to DS, “multiracial” was chosen after polling representatives within the advocacy groups. Through social identity and collective actions, this particular organisation was able to decide on “multiracial,” which has been influential in the ways that racialised mixedness is constructed in the United States to present. This form of idioculture
encouraged advocacy groups in general to rally around the agreed-upon term. The far-reaching effects of using the term “multiracial” in this way are evident in the ways that the term is recognised and used in many US institutions, such as mass and social media, the academy, and in everyday conversations, for a unified notion of mixed race.

GH’s (US) work encompasses an early-childhood through tertiary education outreach, representing a type of external network mechanism for mixed race construction. Specifically, he told me that works with “multiracial families, multiracial children, students, graduate students doing research, teachers, childhood teachers, elementary K-12 [Kindergarten through twelfth grades, covering primary and secondary education] teachers, social workers, adoptive parents, very wide range.” When I asked about his goals for the organisation, he listed his priority issues to address:

GH: Specific to the United States, the number one issue is the lack of a place on the federal forms, number one issue. The second issue is the total lack of knowledge on the part of all professionals who are working with this population. Those are the two central issues that I would say....

His concern about “federal forms” refers to the advocacy work his organisation has been involved in to introduce a mixed race category on the national census and all federal forms that record racialised categorisations, reflective of the organisation’s parallel civil society work. For GH, his two concerns are related, in that without “accurate” forms, schools and universities cannot adequately assess and monitor student racial demographics. Consequently, schools and universities are not held accountable for representative curricula or outcomes for students identified as mixed race. According to GH, the teachers and school/university administration staff are wilfully stuck in a “single race” paradigm that excludes children from more than one race.

GH: I would say that most organisations don’t want to deal with it. Whether we’re talking about, again, the [K-12] school district. Very interesting, while we did the training and the issue of the racial categories came up, the lady who hired me said, “I don’t want you to even address that because the superintendent [head of school district] says we don’t want to deal with it.” So, organisations don’t want to deal with it on any level. [...]
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On [an] organisational level, they just want to stick with the five big [racialised] groups. They don’t want to deal with anything else.

In light of his perspective, GH uses his work to challenge attitudes such as these in order to create a space within education for students racialised as mixed. As the students are recognised by staff as mixed, GH believes that their specific needs, such as learning and financial support services available on the basis of racialised classifications, can be accommodated and monitored comparable to other racialised groups.

XP (GB) also works in education and is based in a large city. Though in contrast to GH, XP does not run training for teaching staff, but rather trains and convenes workshops with primarily teenaged students and young adults. Through students, XP uses mechanisms based in external networks and collective action to facilitate conversations about mixedness. The aim of his organisation is to encourage visibility for what he sees as an overlooked group in schools and across society. As he explains further:

XP: Okay, I’d say within education, that [there is a] lack of representation within the curriculum. There is a lack of knowledge and understanding among professionals from all multiagency backgrounds around appropriate terminology. There’s lack of physical representation within schools — em, wall displays, that kind of thing – presenting a mixed race identity. To the students. There’s also an absence of a discussion around mixed identity and race relation policies within most schools. Um, multi-agencies seem to have researched this subject and adopted outdated notions and views of mixed race identity from American academic perspective. Which, using that old rule of the one-drop rule, one drop of Black blood, in view, they’re Africans and Black.

To address these issues, XP brings together students, forming collectivities and spaces for collective discourse. This allows them to lead discussions about terminology, experience, and representation. The students then collect this information and present it to their peers and school staff, using the group as an actor for collective decision making and an apparatus for social change in their schools. The goal is to present mixedness to the school in ways not previously
done before to create more comfort around discussing mixed race and to normalise the experience.

The remaining British organisations are oriented towards providing local services to their local catchment areas. Because they are linked to a variety of external organisations, such as the local council, organisations such as Jobcentre Plus and Citizens Advice Bureaux, and the National Health Service, it is their extended networks through which they are able to construct notions of mixedness. Through engagement and service requests, these organisations frame mixed race individuals or families as having specific particular issues in society that require help to overcome. In contrast to the advocacy groups that have an outward and vocal focus toward wider society on behalf of mixed race people, support groups turn their focus toward their specific collectivity, in that their focus is in working with mixed race people that they engage with personally to better equip them in society. In that respect, the social capital of community, common purpose, and material and moral support is a direct result of extended network engagement. A majority of this type of support organisations that I interviewed were based in Britain, and at least in part utilised public services to achieve their support goals.

JC (GB) told me that although it is hard to generalise social disadvantage among those constructed as mixed race, she names the “endemic” issue of belonging as the initial motivation for the services she offers and wants to put into place. Thus, isolation and belonging are a significant part of her constructions mixedness:

JC: It’s very hard, I think, to generalise. I think you find, I come from a mixed race background and there’s endemic issues around belonging. Sometimes it just depends on who was the overt parent or the overt carer that puts into your life so to speak. And then once you come into maybe a school system or a community system, it might be another group. […] So, depending on the endemic thing that we have in our area are issues of education, social exclusion, the low income poor housing—and when I say “poor housing,” there are issues where you can have a family of five in [a] one-bedroomed place and a parent struggling to try to take courses and it’s crazy. I actually had one parent who’s said, “I’m worried about taking this class, what should I do?” you know? I said, “Get a big
box and write on it ‘Do Not Touch’ so that you keep all your stuff in it from your kids.”

On behalf of those who use her service, JC liaises with a variety of local organisations that offer support around childcare, education, housing, employment, free legal advice, health and nutrition, and transportation. JC creates a narrative where the sense of not belonging (familial, cultural, or societal) becomes a catalyst for the social issues that her organisation then attempts to address. Through her talk about social exclusion and belonging, JC references a hegemonic discourse whereby the minoritisation of individuals and families leads to a lack of integration and social equality with majority social groupings (Levitas 1996). She uses this model to rationalise and normalise the social issues found within her group.

In addition to multi-focus organisations, Britain also has organisations that focus on one area of disadvantage. One example of this is FT’s (GB) organisation that focuses on the area of mental health. Similar to JC, FT referenced the idea of belonging by speaking about cultural experiences for mixed race clients.

FT: I think a lot of people actually find themselves more comfortable to actually classify themselves as Black, you know? I think it’s due to what [Colleague] said about culture, and culture being not just the culture that you were born with, culture in which you are experiencing it and sharing in it. So, for instance, if you break bread and you do so many things, you’re like...you would see yourself in that culture, you know, and then you wouldn’t see yourself in any other culture.

FT goes on to speak about a specific client, “Matthew,” whose mother (described as “White”) referred him to the organisation because:

FT: [S]he felt that she couldn’t give him that bit of culture, ...she realised that the whole world sees him as Black and she wanted him to have that experience.

FT’s use of “culture” refers generally to minoritised culture groups in contrast to a notion of normalised (and therefore “decultured”) majority cultures, which is similar to JC’s ideas around belonging to majority culture. However, FT’s perspective and motives differ from JC’s in that instead of assisting clients to integrate into majority culture, FT supports initiatives that support social inclusion and integration into minoritised culture groups. For her, the mixed race clients are disadvantaged by attempts to assimilate into majority culture at the expense of their minoritised
cultures, largely because they not accepted as being part of the majority culture. These issues of belonging are addressed when her clients begin to participate in the social groups into which society racialises them.

The external mechanisms used in the United States and Britain begin to expose the distinctions in the ways that mixed race is constructed in both nations at the meso-levels. In the case of Britain, organisations rely on approaches that use primarily external networks to construct mixed race outside of the organisation on localised scales. In the case of XP, his organisation uses strategies of collective action in order to create spaces for discourses around mixed race and collective decisions about what it means to be mixed race. Following that, the groups acts as a united actor in order to solicit change within the extended networks of connection. Organisations led by JC, VY, and FT use their extended networks to provide support services to their users, for the purposes of improving social capital. In each of these groups, racialised constructions comes from sustained interactions and negotiations among external networks.

In contrast, the external mechanisms used by US groups primarily use civil society approaches in order to affect mixed race constructions on a national level. They use strategies of collective action and idioculture in order to encourage a notion of a group culture. This discursive strategy mobilised political action to campaign for a “multiracial” category on the US Census and all other federal forms with racialised classifications. In contrast to using approaches that affect individuals directly, the external mixed race discursive practices are largely directed toward institutional constructions. The resulting constructions are more shared across organisations and more visible outside of the mixed race meso-level.

MACRO-LEVEL AND MESO-LEVEL INTERACTIONS
In order to understand the dynamics between the meso-level and macro-level racial projects, I turn to the notion of “governmentality” developed in the later work of Michel Foucault. His exploration focused on the historical shifting of rationalities behind and implementations of power and control in contemporary European
societies (McKee 2009). After his death, Anglophone social scientists have continued to elaborate on the concept (e.g., Burchell et al. 1991; Dean 1999; Gordon 1991; Miller 1987; Rose and Miller 1992), as his work went unfinished due to his death in 1984. Governmentality is a valuable analytical framework through which to understand power and rule (McKee 2009). It attempts to “make sense of the political project” through analysing:

how subjects of governance are actively created and mobilized and the rationales and techniques of government that define, characterize and incorporate them for particular ends.

Raco 2003: 76.

For Foucault, the political project is one that attempts to shape and control the growing, increasingly diverse populace in ways that enable effective governance (Raco 2003).

Governmentality is said to be the “art” or the “mentality” of government (Dean 1999; Fyfe 2005; Hunt and Wickham 1994; Mayhew 2004; McKee 2009; Raco 2003). Foucault proposed that governmentality highlights

the mentalities, rationalities, and techniques used by governments, within a defined territory, actively to create the subjects (the governed), and the social, economic, and political structures, in and through which their policy can best be implemented.


As modern Western governments have shifted away from authoritarian rule of territory, Foucault suggests that governments have evolved to utilise approaches to manage populations through calculated strategies and practices (Jessop 2007; McKee 2009). Hence, governmentality exposes the intentionality of governments to employ more covert mechanisms that attempt to foster and optimise social control (Dean 1999; Fyfe 2005; Hunt and Wickham).

Governmentality focuses on the use of power “as it creates subjects, discourses, and institutions through time” (Bevir 1999: 353). Not only does it acknowledge the power of the state, but also examines the power relationships that manifest within the state at other institutional and group levels. Power is operationalised as both
the technologies used to govern, as well as the mentalities or rationalities behind governance (Merlingen 2003).

A governmentality approach focuses on the interactions of multiple types of group and institutional bodies. The interactions represent the processes of continual dialogue between macro-level and meso-level bodies, thus “opening up…new space[s] between the state and civil society (Morison 2000). Therefore, it provides a way to explore mixed race organisations within Britain and the United States, and the ways that particular organisations have responded to macro-level influences of power. Alongside new “rationalities,” new mechanisms, or “technologies,” are developed within the realm of the state in order to “stimulate agency while simultaneously reconfiguring (rather than removing) constraints upon the freedom of choice” (Morison 2000: 119). Strategies of governmentality manage through engagement with numerous, competing non-state entities within the state, and the translation of power from one space to another (Morison 2000; Rose and Miller 1992). Power, influence, and authority exist beyond the macro-level, though the governed are ultimately restricted by the governing institutions.

**Great Britain**
Chapter Four analysed the ways in which the ONS constructs mixed race as a state macro-level racial project. As an attempt to reduce the number of write-in responses for the “Ethnicity” question, the census in 2001 introduced four “Mixed Ethnicity” options along the other racialised categories developed for the 1991 census. As meso-level racial projects, British mixed race organisations have had little direct engagement with the ONS during the development of the Mixed Ethnicity question (Aspinall 2003; Caballero 2004). Instead, mixed race organisations have engaged with other areas of the state throughout their development and activities, such as government funding bodies, local councils, and Local Education Authorities (LEAs). Although there was some exception, many of the mixed race organisations that I spoke to were sceptical of the government; speaking about how they intentionally remain free of government engagement and influence. This will be explored more below.
Since the United Kingdom’s Labour government lead by Tony Blair, trends in governance have shifted state control in various sectors to more local or private institutions (Fyfe 2005; Morison 2000; Raco 2003). Instead of the government managing all social programmes, services have become “localised” through sharing and/or allocating responsibilities to external organisations. Subsequently:

What may be presented as increasing autonomy, a chance to govern oneself, is in fact a reconfiguration of rationalities so that the self-interest of (part of) the sector aligns with the interests of a state seeking to mobilise a reserve army of support effectively and on its own terms.


The state strategically utilises its power in order to achieve what it has always achieved, but now through the means of the populace instead.

One way that meso-level groups have engaged and/or contested the state has been in the area of funding. The organisations were funded in a variety of ways. Some were commissioned by government agencies, whilst others reported to be completely self-funded.

NW: We set up the program...after we identified that there was no support specifically for mixed race families living in [County] and approached the [County] Racial Equality Taskforce.... [I came] along and hadn’t really come across many families that identified as being mixed race and needing support. Um, so, it was set up by the community member, that was me, um, and I had the support of a Family [Support] Service manager from a family centre based in [Town]. [...] So they helped me find, well they helped me look for a group that could possibly support me and that’s how we got in touch with the [Region] Racial Equality Council. And obviously as we realised that there was nothing there, the idea came about that perhaps I should look at setting up one myself. But obviously I couldn’t do it myself, I’d have to research to find out what the need was down this way and we discovered that actually there was a need but what was significant was that it was quite invisible and people didn’t really want to talk about it. [...] I was able to build up a really good picture of, of the fact that support could be required and how, the kind of things to put down on the paper, um, to possibly help me find funding.
NW represents one organisation that is funded by government money. As she explains it, she originally was looking for support services for herself and her family, but was unable to find something suitable in her local area. Through engaging with the Family Support Service (FSS) and the Racial Equality Council (REC), she was guided in the process of setting up an organisation. FSS and REC had significant roles in the development of this particular mixed race organisation. They guided her through the process, assigned a support worker to manage the project, helped outline and develop the remit, and assisted with the funding applications, including developing the language that would facilitate successful applications. NW recounted her experience in a positive way, expressing gratitude for the assistance. She did not convey any scepticism toward government agencies, likely viewing them as neutral sources of help.

This particular type of engagement with governmental agencies is an example of the process that Nicholas R. Fyfe discusses in his critique of “neo-communitarianism” (Fyfe 2005). Fyfe describes neo-communitarianism as the increased focus on voluntary and community organisations (VCOs) for “improving social welfare and reinvigorating a sense of civil society” (Fyfe 2005: 536). Through “encouraging active citizenship and fostering social capital,” the government aims to address their larger agenda of social exclusion in line with national policy (Fyfe 2005: 538). Emma Carmel and Jenny Harlock refer to this governance through VCOs as the “dispersed state” (Carmel and Harlock 2008: 155). Fyfe argues that the British state has increased its use of voluntary sector organisations, through partnership and funding, in order to reach its wider goals of social control.

Though NW benefited through the help she received from the FSS and REC, the interaction between the meso-level and macro-level racial projects does not solely benefit the former. Through the assistance and funding, the government has influence over the mixed race organisation. Though NW describes a pleasant working relationship with those who assisted her, ultimately she is accountable to these organisations and the funders. She was required to state specific aims and desired outcomes in her applications, by which she is monitored and evaluated.
Continued funding is, in part, dependent on the ability of the organisation to meet its outlined aims and outcomes. Without funding, the organisation ceases to exist. Thus, the state retains its role as an overseer and a “gate-keeper” to ensure that the partnership ultimately works towards realising state goals.

Though NW did not mention any scepticism she may have had toward government involvement in her organisation, other respondents were more vocal about theirs. LJ, who is self-funded, spoke critically about the former Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) and the way she viewed the effect of government funding on its effectivity.

LJ: [The Commission for Racial Equality] started with really good intentions and what happened was the government threw a load of money at it and then started dictating what work it could and could not do. And this tends to happen, is you are reliant on government money, they will throw money at you, but they will control what you do and what you say and you know, we didn’t want that. I didn’t want that…which is what I won’t take government money.

LJ shows awareness of the type of dynamics Fyfe and Carmel and Harlock describe. The CRE was not officially a governmental organisation, but rather a quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation (QUANGO). As such, it was technically independent, though ultimately the commissioners were held accountable to the state through the UK Parliament. Consequently, the CRE could only do work of which the government approved. From LJ’s perspective, the links to macro-level racial projects lead to a lack of autonomy in projects and outcomes.

LJ: I, I tried to get [smilingly]—well, I contacted the Commission for Racial Equality and tried to get some support and they said to me that I would never get any support because the government doesn’t think there’s enough mixed race people.

Here, LJ describes a consequence of not fitting the interests of the state. Whereas NW was able to access government funds for her work focusing on racialised mixedness, LJ was told by the CRE that the need was insufficient. Through dispersing the state by increasing the focus on government and VCO partnerships,

---

9 The Commission for Racial Equality was merged with two other commissions into the Equality and Human Rights Commission in 2007.
the former has significant control over not only the work that organisation can do, but the types of organisations that develop, as financial resources are a key component of organisational viability.

XP corroborates the concerns about VCOs that LJ expressed above. XP also runs a self-funded mixed race organisation. He sees government funding as a hurdle to which many organisations succumb. I asked him about whether he feels supported by the government:

XP: No. And that’s down to two things. That’s down to them not being massively aware of my work, but also on to funding in this area. Because, because it’s such a unique discussion, I think a lot of funders are scared to get involved in funding research about mixed race identity. So, it means grassroots organisations find it really difficult to get off the ground because you can’t get funding, hence the reason why I self-funded from the start. Because I didn’t want to become grant-dependent.

XP also hints at the idea that LJ explored above, that the topic of “mixed race” is not one that the government is readily willing to fund. XP proposes that it is fear that prevents funding bodies to focus on mixedness. Mixedness is positioned here as “unique,” which perhaps is implicitly opposed to racialisation into singular categories and reflects the relatively newer official categories of mixedness. XP and LJ provide examples of how mixed race organisations are contesting the state in its acknowledgement and prioritisation of mixed race construction. Reflected in their accounts is a positioning of the state is that does not acknowledge “mixed race” as an area that requires funding and support, which is directly at odds to organisations that form explicitly for those purposes.

In addition to funding, mixed race organisations engaged with macro-level racial projects through the development and delivery of their work. This is largely done through approaching local government organisations and councils to offer their relevant services to the community.
XP labelled his organisation as a “social enterprise.” The government defines social enterprises as businesses that have community or social aims (GOV.UK 2015). As he explained:

XP: I describe it as a social enterprise. [...] Our main theme is positive contribution to mixed race discussion.

[...]

CLN: Okay, alright. How was it formed?

XP: Em, I put my own money into this. It’s a self-funded project, so I basically just put my money together and used my networks—I worked...for about fifteen years, and I used the money and the network of professional contacts I had to start a pilot project back in 2006.

As XP is not receiving any public money to run his organisation; his engagement with local governing bodies is different from the process NW outlined above. Instead of developing the programme alongside the state, XP developed his programme and then approached the state. Following on from his quote above, XP discussed the development of his organisation after the pilot project:

XP: And from there, I just developed more and more work, and more and more projects and responded to the needs of different local education authorities.

As the relationship between the local government bodies (such as LEAs, which are required to adhere to the National Curriculum and are accountable to the state) and his organisation developed, he then began developing additional projects that responded to the stated needs of the specific body. As his organisation is not reliant on their funding or commissioning, he retains autonomy and flexibility in the ways that he develops and delivers the work. Using this model, XP eventually would like to approach different areas of government management in order to be “the largest and the leading in the UK” for multiagency training and resources.

Nearly all of the mixed race organisations in Britain engage the state at local levels. Along with XP, LJ and NW do at least a portion of their work in schools, thus interacting with LEAs. NW, VY, SF, and JC work with younger children and families, which requires links to Family Support Services. VY, SF, and JC also provide services relating to employment, benefits, and housing services. FT is funded by the NHS, and thus delivers work around health. In all these spaces, mixed race
continues to be introduced, shaped, contested, and refined through the interactions of the government and the mixed race organisations.

Although the British mixed race organisations all engage directly with various areas of the government, very few engage specifically with the ONS and census outputs. The organisation that FT runs exceptionally does use census data in the context of its work:

FT: We do use [census data], um, let me have a look if I’ve got one [organisation monitoring form] here to show you. [...] So, you’ve got, um, this is right here, Mixed background: White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian, Black and Asian, Black and Chinese, Black and White, Chinese and White, Asian and Chinese.

FT’s organisation does demographic monitoring of its clients, which includes collecting racialised data. FT expresses that the categories they use come directly from the census, however this is only partly accurate. Categories such as White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian are official categories of the census. However, the additional groups she lists are not found on census forms and are not official categories of the ONS. The use of the ONS categories as a basis with the additional creation of categories (based on ONS nomenclature\(^{10}\)) shows a negotiating process happening between the state level, which mandates the categories; and the meso-level organisation, which adjusts them to fit their own requirements.

Other mixed race organisations either do not use census data at all in their work, or use it only to provide context in their interactions with service users:

XP: We haven’t had to use [census data] at all. Maybe occasionally, I use it as a stimulus for discussion with young people.

CLN: Okay.

\(^{10}\) The National Health Service (NHS) frequently uses categories such as these, which are based on the ONS official ethnicity categories. The categories are accompanied by a code, which can then be used to “harmonise” the categories into the official ones used by the ONS (NHS 2013). The additional mixed ethnicity categories given are coded into the “Any other mixed background” subcategory of “Mixed ethnicity.” RA’s organisation uses the categories as expressed without recoding.
XP: But other than that, it hasn’t featured heavily in our work. This illustrates the relative irrelevance the census data has for most of the mixed race organisations. If they are not required to use it, due to their funding sources or partnerships, they rarely use it at all. Thus, the constructions that macro-level organisations produce for mixed race people are not generally shaping the work of meso-level organisations at a significant level. It is perhaps because of this that contestations between meso-level and macro-level projects were a highlighted, salient feature throughout my interviews. There was a significant amount of negative positioning of the government by organisations, and frustration about funding and potential government influence. With NW as an exception, there is a sense the meso-level groups generally positioning themselves as “at odds” with the state. This makes for a dynamic space for the negotiation of racial formation and mixed race construction, which with be explored further in the following chapter.

USA
In the United States, the interactions between the state and meso-level organisations differ most significantly in the overt political actions that some mixed race organisations participated in leading up to Census 2000. Whilst organisations in Britain were largely overlooked during the consultations for the 2001 census, a few prominent organisations in the United States played a major role towards the change in the race question to allow respondents to mark more than one response. In addition to this difference, organisations tended to engage with a different set of areas of the state and did not focus as much on funding (and its obstacles) as British organisations.

In addition to governmentality exposing the rationalities of the shifting of central governing responsibilities to more local, diverse bodies, a governmentality framework can:

…also [look] at the ways in which particular interests may use similar procedures, discourses and practices to promote their own agendas and develop new forms of resistance, contestation and challenge to emerging policy frameworks.

(Raco 2003: 75).
These types of interactions encourage opportunities for meso-level bodies “to shape and contest the discourses and practices of government” (Raco 2003: 75). An example of this is the campaigning and advocacy that some mixed race groups participated in during the consultation period for Census 2000.

Of the organisations that I interviewed, four indicated that they were at least somewhat involved in campaigning for a “multiracial” category on the census. CD described the meetings her organisation participated in throughout the 1990s:

CD: In June of 1993, [sister organisation] representatives testified before the Congressional Subcommittee on Census and Population. As a result, we represented the multiracial community at a meeting of federal governmental agencies at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington [DC]. We continue to work with the Office of Management and Budget, Census Bureau, and members of Congress. [The organisation founder, her son, and another member] testified before the House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology....

The campaigning organisations engaged with various areas of the US federal government in order to advocate for a multiracial category on the census. CD refers to this as “representing” work, implying that the representatives spoke for a singular, unified mixed race population with one position on the matter.

Speaking more about other mixed race organisations, DS, the founder of CD’s sister organisation offered:

DS: Much of our work has been talking with Census Bureau decision makers about how the racial data will appear and the tabulation, which most other multiracial organizations either do not understand or have succumbed to pressure from other racial and ethnic groups to allow data to be unfairly re-tabulated.

DS tacitly acknowledges that not everyone in the “multiracial community” agrees with her organisations’ positioning. However, instead of engaging with other meso-level projects forging their own ideas of mixed race within the contexts of their work, she dismisses their perspectives as either naïve or compromised. Evidenced here is the possibility of racial formation also occurring in the
contestations between meso-level racial projects in addition to macro-level engagements.

Similar to the organisations in Britain, the US organisations also do not use the census data much in their projects. As in Britain, a couple of organisations mentioned that they may use the categories as an opening for discussion or as an introduction to their work. But none of the organisations use the categories or data more than that. GH theorised as to why this may be the case:

GH: US government. Um, I think right now, the government sees mixed race simply as a thorn in the side. They’ve done a minimum to appease the people who want to [have a mixed race category], to a degree. [...] It’s the politics of race and the politics of race only survive if you view in each single race group as an independent political entity that then can create power, on and on. The minute you say you can cross over, you destroy...their base and that’s the end of that. So they don’t want to do that.

GH expressed great cynicism towards the US government throughout our conversation. He does not believe that the government is “on the side” of mixed race people in the country. Thus, his scepticism leads him to refrain from engagement with the government any more than necessary. For him, the lack of consideration from the government is due to how mixed race is constructed vis-à-vis other racialised groups. “Single race groups” fit well with the current government system, but the shift to allow belonging to more than one racial group (that, in itself, an “appeasement” from the original desire for a separate category) disrupts the current racialised order.

The US organisations expressed significant frustration regarding the OMB and the Census 2000 racial question. This frustration led to a small number advocating at the federal level to add a “multiracial” category to the official categories. As covered in Chapter Four, in the end, the US Census Bureau did not add a “Multiracial” category as requested, but instead opted for a “mark one or more” races approach, where respondents were directed to select as many of the census race options they felt applied to them. Although few organisations admitted that this change was better than nothing, none were happy with the compromise and
continued to advocate for their desired “multiracial” category for the census in 2010. Despite their continued contestations, the decision to allow “mark one or more” races was upheld for the 2010 census. This ongoing interaction is an example of the “dialectical process of definition and contestation” that reveals the power struggle dynamics between macro-level and meso-level groups (Raco 2003: 75). This direct political involvement is distinctive for the US, as the organisations in Britain were all but omitted from the consultation process. This background, as GH hypothesised, influences the lack of use by US organisations of census data. At minimum, GH’s organisation does not use the data, in part because of a general distrust of the government and its motivations regarding mixed race. At the very least, it is likely that the general frustration expressed by all the organisations that I spoke to influences their rejection of census data in the various work that they do.

The topic of funding did not feature much during the US interviews. None are funded directly by the government. Despite the VCO sectors being structured differently in the US and Britain, perhaps it is not surprising that organisations that generally have a negative view of the government (with some directly campaigning against their policies) are not government-funded. This allows for the organisations to decide their aims and outcomes without direct macro-level influence. Of the organisations that did disclose their funding sources, two (LJ and CD) receive donations for the work that they do. TN “crowdsources” funding through allowing gatherings to be hosted in multiple locations around the country by multiple people, who then seek their own local funding (usually through donations) to develop their own programme. In this way, the financial burden is spread out and, subsequently, the effort is more “grassroots.”

The US mixed race organisations commonly engaged with state education bodies in various capacities. In addition to the census focus, CD discussed the work that they are doing in school around the country:

CD: [Organisation and sister organisation] addresses the needs of the multiracial community in many ways. We have been a catalyst to new legislation in several states and changes in many organisations. We continue to work with legislators to
have the term “multiracial” added to forms that require a person’s race.

The “forms” CD references are monitoring documents that schools and other organisations use to collect demographic data on students. The type of campaigning that CD describes focuses “the needs of the multiracial community” to the ability to identify as such on official forms.

GH is an educator, and within that role he found himself providing support specifically to parents of mixed race children.

GH: I would get calls in my office—at that point I was [another organisation] Director—wanting information and I would get parents calling me or e-mailing me and asking me what to do, and, I would get—I would generate some publications because there was nothing out there in education and in psychology, in early childhood. So, at some point I said, “You know, I’m doing this anyway, let’s call it something,” so I just called it [name of organisation] and continued what I was doing.

Through his previous position, GH was viewed as an authority figure. Subsequently, when his work shifted to his current role as founder of a mixed race organisation, he was able to build upon that status and develop a wider client base. In addition to the writing he describes above, he also authors books and articles, facilitates school trainings, and is a faculty member of a university.

In addition to the areas of engagement where the US and British organisations overlap, the US also engages with some areas that are distinct from the British set. The engagement with federal medical organisations in the United States is largely campaign-based, which is different from the funding and service delivery remit of the organisations based in Britain.

DS: We stay aware of what is being done in the medical community and also offer to educate about our needs. [Sister organisation] has done a fabulous public service announcement (NWA) about those needs, which has gotten national and international exposure on the internet. Our [sister organisation] president has been working with the National Institutes of Health in Washington [DC] about the medical needs. We also hold bone marrow donor drives whenever we have the opportunity. I just heard last week about a medical
researcher not far from me who is studying the pharmacological effects of medications on different racial and ethnic groups. These are the kinds of people we seek out and contact.

DS’s organisation and its sister organisation advocate for the “medical needs” of mixed racialised people. In this way, there are engaging with the larger medical field, including state-run organisations. In these engagements, they are putting forward the perceived needs of mixed racialised people and creating a space for the interactions of contestation and acceptance needed for negotiating the various constructions of mixed race.

In addition to the macro-level racial projects outlined above, one additional area that was utilised as a space of engagement repeatedly was mass media. There are no (officially\(^\text{11}\)) state-run mass media organisations in the United States; therefore, mass media could potentially be considered another example of a meso-organisation and an important site for racial formation. GH has been interviewed for the *London Times*. QQ’s organisation produces a national magazine around the issues of race and mixed race. As mentioned above, DS’s and CD’s organisations use the internet (including social media) for promoting their campaigns, as well as disseminating public service announcements on radio, television, and online. HJ represents an organisation that partners with a media advocacy organisation, which promotes diversity in various media and liaises with leaders in the US entertainment industry to increase media access for mixed race and other underrepresented groups. TN’s organisation began as a media project; as part of his Masters of Fine Arts (MFA) thesis, he created the project digitally and launched it after he graduated.

In each of these engagements with mass or social media, the mixed race organisations entered into a space that they perceived did not have sufficient representation of their views on mixed race. They entered into these spaces in

\(^{11}\) Although mass media in the United States is supposed to be independently-run and guaranteed by the US Constitution’s First Amendment, the state does at times influence, promote, and/or censor coverage (McChesney 2004).
order to contest the perceived omission and inhabit areas that have limited constructions of mixed race, either because of an underrepresentation of racialised diversity generally or an underrepresentation of the concept of racialised mixing.

The strategies and rationalities of the macro-levels in the United States and Britain illustrate particularly contrasting approaches to the ways in which they engage with meso-level organisations and negotiate power and influence. In the case of Britain, governmentality is presented as cooperative. This allows centralised power to be dispersed to meso-level organisations for the purpose of developing limited agency, surveilled through funding and monitoring. Other organisations are suspicious of more overt governmental influences, so they attempt to run independently, however they too remain within the realm of the state, and are so limited in what they are allowed to do under the law.

In contrast, in the US, the meso-level organisations tend to have a more contested relationship with macro-level groups. This can be seen in the relationships some mixed race organisations had with the US Census Bureau over mixed race classification options. Mixed race organisations mobilised their power through collective action and civic engagement, and the state allowed for an alternative form of mixed race categorisation in line with its racialised agenda. Although both organisations possess power in this ongoing political project, the relative levels of power mean that the state has ultimate authority over classification schemes for the state. As mixed race organisations are also under the laws of the state, they are required to submit to a classification system that they find unfavourable. In this way, they only have limited freedom resist the state and its prerogatives.

**Conclusion**
The meso-level racial projects examined above are examples of the various ways that mixed race has been constructed and represented contemporarily within the context of the US and British censuses in 2000/2001. Meso-level racial projects have a significant role in the racialisation practices in each nation. It is precisely the middle-ground positioning between the macro-levels and micro-levels that makes
meso-level analyses important for understanding wider social processes. Particular to my interest on the role of influence and power in racialisation practices, I have focused on examining the ways that meso-level racial projects participate in the constructions of mixedness on their own, as well as in their interactions with macro-level racial projects. They engage and contest the government and its constructions of mixed race through multiple sites. This partnership and conflict contribute to the collective racial formation processes in ways specific to organisations with at least some authority.

In particular, mixed race constructions through mixed race organisations based in the United States reveal the ways that political action is both encouraged and restricted by the state. US organisations have been able to mobilise their relative power through creating idioculture around constructions of mixed race and use their collective social resources to contest the government regarding their representation. Although ultimately they were not satisfied with the result of their campaign efforts, they have been able to achieve wide-spread recognition and constructions of “multiraciality” throughout the United States. The momentum generated in their efforts for Census 2000 have continued to the present, and their links throughout the nation are larger than they were in 2000, due to continued advocacy and social networking.

In Britain, the interactions of the macro-level with mixed race organisations are focused on the ways that the state can promote or restrict organisational goals. The organisations generally have and utilise extended networks in the work that they do. However, their goals are less overtly political and are more oriented toward creating community for collective action or for the purposes of increasing social capital for their members. Organisations tend to be willing to interact with external organisations for the purposes of their explicit aims, but are generally more resistant to macro-level influence of how the organisation is run. An exception to this is the group run by NW, who welcomed macro-level help and financial support to start the organisation after local officials identified a need for it. With all of these cases, the perceived or actual influence by the state illustrates the saliency of its
governmentality strategies and its continued power in constructing racialised
discourses through its interactions with meso-level groups.

In the next chapter, I will return to the meso-level strategies highlighted at the
beginning of this chapter and explore how social identity, social capital, and
idioculture are used in meso-level racialisation processes. I will do this by
examining the intragroup strategies used by mixed race groups that organise for the
primary goal of community.
Chapter Six: Meso-Level Mixed Race Constructions

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

DS: …[A] mixed race or multiracial individual [is] someone who is of two or more distinct racial groups.

XP: …[Mixed is]…something you feel or you don’t.

The above two quotes from the mixed race organisation interviews convey the vastly divergent constructions of mixed race among mixed race organisation in the United States and Britain. DS (US) defines mixed race in a precise manner that relies on an assumption of objectivity to distinguish who falls into multiple categories and who does not. The contrasting quote from XP (GB) expresses a subjective construction of mixed race that does not rely explicitly on categorisation, but rather on criteria left vague, intuitive, and determined by aspects of personal choice.

What is reflected at the heart of these quotes are the different ways that mixed race can be and is being constructed in everyday practices. “Mixed race” is a concept that seems relatively certain to a particular representative or organisation (even in its ambiguity, in the second example). However, notions of mixed race are shaped by historical and social influences and yield varying ideas over time and in different spaces. This is the case even among groups that organise around the common nomenclature of “mixed race,” as will be explore in this chapter.

The previous chapter explored the role of meso-level organisations in the process of racial formation. Focusing on mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain, I argued that through the particular positioning between the micro- and macro-level racial projects with relative influence and power through group status, they are able to engage with the state in ways that micro-level projects cannot. Because of their positioning, they are able to adopt and/or resist macro-level racialisation through their interactions with the state and other social actors. By focusing on this meso-positioning, mixed race organisations become an additional
point of enquiry to investigate racial formation in a given space. Specifically, by examining the ways in which meso-level organisations have engaged with the state, I have shown that these particular interactions are important factors in the way that race continues to be constructed across time and place.

This chapter will continue examining racial formation in meso-level organisations by shifting the focus from their relationships with macro-level engagements to examinations of the organisations themselves. The research question that will guide my analyses is *How do meso-level mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain conceptualise and operationalise the construction of “mixed race”?* I will begin by returning to the mechanisms that I outlined in Chapter Five and examine the ways that the intragroup mechanisms of social identity, social capital, and idioculture are used in mixed race organisations to construct mixed race. Following this analysis, I will explore the ways that these organisations are constructing mixed race in both nations. As racial projects, mixed race organisations are a site of the discursive (re)production of race (Elam 2011; Sexton 2008; Spencer 2011). The substance of these (re)productions is highlighted through the ways that the organisations speak about race and mixed race. In this analysis, I will also identify the racial paradigms through which the organisations understand and formulate mixed race. Understanding this further clarifies the fundamental ways that mixed race is conceptualised and operationalised by the organisations, how that is reflected in the work they do, and ultimately how that influences their relationship and interactions with macro-level racial projects and the larger society.

**Intragroup Mechanisms of Mixed Race Construction**

In this section, I will examine the mechanisms mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain use to construct mixed race as meso-level racial projects. In the previous chapter, I examined what I termed external mechanisms; those of collective representation used in interactions outside of each group body. I now turn to examine the remaining mechanisms outlined by Gary Alan Fine. These rely on strategies and processes that occur within each group boundary and are used to create community entities.
LJ (GB) runs a “virtual” organisation that is web- and social media based. She creates and curates digital content (e.g., news, stories, visual arts) through people who self-identify as mixed race. She explains that the main goal of her organisation is to provide content and resources “from a mixed race perspective” (i.e., an implied singular construction). Speaking about her initial motivations for starting the group, she explained:

LJ: Basically, I formed it...because there was nothing out there in the UK, there was nothing that came from a mixed race perspective. There were some organisations that had been set up by parents of mixed race children, but there was nothing from the mixed race perspective, and that’s why I formed it, basically.

LJ’s group is a type of advocacy for people racialised as mixed. In contrast to the political advocacy work done by US organisations, the goal of LJ’s group is through representative outreach. LJ expressed dissatisfaction in the lack of representation from “a mixed race point-of-view,” including that from the parents of mixed race individuals. Through her outreach work, she advocates for a normalised “mixed race experience” and to “add balance” to what she considers the “negative stories” pervasive in society. Her outreach focuses on increasing representation in a variety of areas: literature, film, historical accounts, and media. Whilst she has goals to increase mixed race representation on the national curriculum, she has not yet begun this advocacy work.

LJ draws on idioculture to create a group mixed race culture. She creates and fixes mixed race construction through creating a community that is based on presumed shared culture and history. The digital content functions as a discursive strategy to encourage notions of belonging and present constructions of knowledge, beliefs, and customs that are then codified as “mixed race” and dispersed throughout the group. As those in the group adhere to the idioculture, the constructions of mixed race are continually solidified as those in the group support and contribute to the idioculture.
NW (GB) runs a type of community group, which focuses on bringing local mixed race individuals and families together. The primary goal is socialising and creating a sense of community. Although nearly all mixed race organisations have this goal to some extent, community groups like hers have meeting up as their goal, opposed to a means to additional ends. Nevertheless, other activities and projects can evolve from this goal, but the main focus is friendship and camaraderie. Both the US and Britain have several community-focused groups among the participating organisations.

NW founded a community organisation in an area of England that is not racially diverse. When seeking community for herself with other families with racialised minorities from there area, as discussed in Chapter Five, she found there were none for mixed race families and was helped by her local government to create her own. She described the purpose for their monthly meetings to me:

NW: So, what we do is essentially we provide a family session once a month for families to interact with each other, to share their life experiences, the children can see that they’re not alone and that there’s other children like them, or importantly that there are other sort of brown-faced children in [county]. Because quite often they might be the only brown-faced child in a school with a White mum, you know, and also they might be the only white-faced child in the school with a Black dad, do you know what I mean? As well as the single parent children who have only got their mums around and for some of them they haven’t really ever got to know their dads. It’s an opportunity for them to interact with some of our Black or mixed race dads, as well. And so really there’s a good positive play system in place because we do a lot of activities. We’ve got a beautiful garden space and the children tend to go out and play football and go climbing on the climbing bars. And so we encourage the parental participation with the children and encourage them to think about that goes two ways, but also with the parents, they’ve got to know other people’s children and interact with them as well as a positive role model.

There is no meeting agenda set; rather the families meet in a designated place and spend time conversing and playing together. This leads to connections, friendships, and mentorship relationships that begin around the area of racialised mixedness, which are examples of the social identity and social capital mechanisms.
through which to construct notions of mixed race. Social identity works through routine co-presence and entitativity over shared identities and history. By building a group through consistent relations, this readily gives way to the production of social capital. Through relationships, members of the group can provide material and moral support to each other, hence further fostering a community. Within this, as members become more comfortable with each other and more confident, they are able to draw from their personal experience and communicate with each other about “what it means to be mixed race.”

NW frames this community around the issue of isolation. She initially felt alone because she did not have any peers of mixed race or know of any families “like hers.” This group fills that void for her. Likewise, she talks about the potential isolation children might feel if they do not “look like” their parents, or if they do not have one of their parents in their lives. Elsewhere, she talks about how mixed race adults also feel isolated from their partner’s family or when they are not visibly identified as mixed race by others. By bringing people together, NW’s groups can build community and address those feelings of isolation by inviting them to be a part of something where they can feel belonging and ownership.

A particularly unique example of a community group is a US organisation run by HJ (US). As most of the mixed race organisations generally focus on mixed race children and their families, hers is specifically geared toward adults between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five. Though not an intentional restriction, the specific demographics of her group tend to be mixed race people with Black and White racialised parentage.

HJ: Frankly, I’d like to—I just like to have parties! So, I’d call it more social, but—[laugh].

[...] Anyway, so I decided to have, like, a barb—well, I think the first one was, actually, we went to a restaurant. But, then I had barbeques and whatever, but it got too big for my house. And it also became a situ—often, it was more women than men. And I really like men. [laugh]. So, I—that was one reason why I expanded it to [Name of group]. So that there could be guys there. [laugh] [...] Anyway, so I did that. The other thing was,
is that I found that people had spousal issues. Because I was just collecting people as biracials, not necessarily anything else. But, a lot of the spouses were like, “Well, you’re going to this and I can’t come? I’m being excluded.” Right? So, and then you also have that group of people who’ll never go anywhere if they can’t bring somebody. You know, “Heaven forbid I go anywhere without my crutch.” So, in order to make sure that more people showed up, it became [Name of group]. It just made for a better party, anyway, so— But that was just a social thing. That group tends to be biracial adults.

HJ is also unique is that she is explicit in her motivation for starting the group: she “just likes to have parties.” HJ’s parties are a way through which to build social identity, as they are organised around mixed race as the social category in common.

She began the social outings in order to build community for mixed race adults, as the other mixed groups she was a part of tended to focus on people in interracial partnerships. This hints at the potential social capital aspects of the group, as there is greater potential for participants among a similar age and stage in life to collect and share resources specific to them than groups that may cater to issues more relevant to families and children. HJ is thoughtful about her goals and the processes through which to encourage interest, attendance, and ultimately a community. She labels it as “just social,” but the focus of bringing together mixed race people on a regular basis indicates that community is also a goal.

**CONSTRUCTING MIXED RACE**

After examining the mechanisms through which racialised constructions are created by mixed race organisations, I now turn to focus on the substance of how the organisations understand and construct mixed race. My aim is to use the nuances of the representatives’ “common sense” constructions of mixed race, and examine how that informs the mixed race constructions that they present to wider society. I will do this by focusing on two elements of construction: the descriptions and conceptions of race used to explain “what race is,” and the paradigms through which they are developed.
This section is divided into three subsections: biological and cultural notion of race, social constructionist paradigms, and post-race paradigms that aim to “do away with race” through mixed race projects. In the first section, I discuss how some of their discourses reify race as a natural biological or cultural sub-grouping of the human race. The second section will explore their understandings of race as a social construct. The section will conclude with an examination of their post-race paradigms and a discussion of how the organisations use elements of the different racial ideologies to define concepts of race and mixed race. Ultimately, this helps to illuminate the ways that mixed race is constructed presently in both nations.

Race: “A sub-group of the human race”
The first (pseudo-)scientific theories developed by various academic disciplines and institutions over the last few centuries to understand race were biological paradigms. (Banton 1998; Garner 2010; Relethford 1996, 2009). Even though social and other academic sciences have widely refuted biological constructions more recently (e.g., Banton 1998; Essed and Goldberg 2002; Garner 2010; Glasgow 2009; Murji and Solomos 2005; Spencer 2011), informed in particular by the work of Joshua Glasgow, my assumption going into the data analysis was that aspects of biological notions are still drawn upon in non-academic, everyday paradigms of race (Garner 2010; Glasgow 2009; Ifekwunigwe 2004; Mason 1999; Zack 2002). Through my conversations with respondents about mixed race, I sought to understand the ways that biology (including biologised cultural notions) and other paradigms are evoked to define and understand it, and race more generally.

Biological paradigms of race are most obviously prevalent among the organisations based in the United States. However, the ways that biological theories are operationalised for constructing mixed race varies from organisation to organisation. The two sister organisations that advocate for a mixed race census category adopt similar, “objective” definitions of race. An example of this is a quote
by DS (US), who prefaces her articulation of mixed race by explaining race more generally:

DS: Race or racial background refers to a sub-group of the human race possessing common physical or genetic characteristics. Race is determined by genetic similarities passed hereditarily. Race is perceived as permanent, although the way a person self-identifies their race(s) may change. Examples include White, Black, and Asian. Ethnicity or ethnic group refers to specific social group sharing a unique cultural heritage. Two people can be of the same race (e.g., White), but be from different ethnic groups (e.g., White and Hispanic/Latino).

The meaning of this expression is similar to contemporary academic biological race paradigms that purport to differentiate population groups (Relethford 1996, 2009). In a similar way to those who still study race with the assumptions of “real” biological human variations and the aim to quantify/qualify them (e.g., Relethford 2009), DS cites phenotype, genetics, and heredity as her “markers” for racial classification. However, even at this level of racial categorisation, when compared to Relethford (2009), DS’s criteria are rather vague (whilst stringent), for—although explicitly not the goal of this particular paper—Biological anthropologist John H. Relethford concludes that race described in this way may “crudely and imprecisely describe real variation” (20, emphasis added). Relethford and others in his field subscribe to biological human variations and classifications by these criteria; however even they are critical of this lack of specificity. He stresses that this particular usage may tend “to reify incorrect conceptions of human variation” (21, emphasis added).

DS gives “White, Black, and Asian” as her examples of races, which are determined by her aforementioned cited criteria. She distinguished between phenotype (“physical”) and genetics, which although closely related, have interesting distinctions when examined more closely. Phenotype refers to the physical, or external appearances (e.g., skin colour, hair colour/texture, eye colour/shape, nose shape/size, etc.) of individuals as criteria for racial classification, whereas genetic characteristics refer to something “internal”—perhaps on the DNA level, or perhaps some idea of “blood quantum,” hypodescent, or parental lineage—that determines race for DS and her organisational work (Bullock 2010; Spickard 1992). There is no
actual genetic testing to determine race within the remit of the organisation’s work, so there is some cultural, social, historical, and/or colloquial element to her use of the terminology. Considering this, these suppositions fit with the idea of heredity, which is also present in her criteria for racial classification. Cultural, social, historical, and/or colloquial elements must work together when phenotype alone does not place individuals into an “obvious” racial category. In this case, race is something that is tied to genetics and phenotype, and is articulated as objective and in fixed categories assigned by the state.

Furthermore, these two organisations appear to have adopted the US Census racial categories uncritically. In explaining her definition of race, DS uses “White, Black, and Asian,” which are three of the official categories used on the US Census (Grieco and Cassidy 2001). She uses them as given and objective, as there is no questioning or further explanation given as to what the racial terms may mean. This is further evidenced by her description of varying ethnicities, which she says could be “White and Hispanic/Latino.” Although she previously described “White” as a type of race, in her example of ethnicity, she uses “White” as a contrast to “Hispanic/Latino.” I believe that she is trying to highlight that “Hispanic/Latino” is, officially at least, not racialised; but rather is viewed by her organisations (and the US Census Bureau) as a separate “ethnicity, which people of any race may have” (SG). However, in the way she describes this, she is implicitly racialising Hispanicity by contrasting it to a racialised category.

While a social constructionist approach to race is not generally applied by this organisation, an interesting nuance in what DS says is that race can be social only inasmuch as the ways people may express their race(s). She says that self-identification may vary from time to time in spite of an implied “actual” race—the way a person is “perceived”—that remains fixed. In this paradigm, DS links “perception” with the characteristics that distinguish human “sub-groups,” which are the (unspecified) external biological characteristics that she cites. Within this, she prioritises these external signifiers as those that determine her objective view of race, whilst allowing for some flexibility in the way that people may identify
themselves. But the self-identification does not alter the permanent nature of race. In this way, her word choice of “perceived” seems to allow for some subjectivity, though her descriptions of the (“actual”) race that is perceived are, to her, objective and fixed.

For the two sister organisations that adopt this racial paradigm, this has particular implications for the ways that they describe mixed race and the specific work they do. For both of the groups, mixed race is also something that is objective, which is illustrated by how CD discusses mixed race:

   CD: I would define a mixed race or multiracial individual as someone who is of two or more distinct racial groups. This would include children of multiracial parents.

Considering the two organisations’ quotes together, as racialised distinctions are discrete and externally assigned based primarily on physical or genetic criteria, “mixed race” within their paradigm is having ancestry from more than one of these constructed racialised categories. For them, mixed race identification, just as other racial categories, is not influenced by personal experiences or other social contexts, nor by the ways individuals may view themselves. An example of this in operation would be if someone had parentage from more than one of their racialised categories, that person may consider themselves to be of one race or of mixed race (or some other racial or non-racial designation entirely), but for the purposes of these organisations, he/she is “mixed race” by the “fact” of their parents’ biological characteristics (and the racial groups into which those characteristics allocate them), as well as possibly his/her own.

This way of describing race is a relatively clear example of a contemporary biological race paradigm. In terms of racial classifications, it is articulated as being objective in nature, which means there is minimal room for individuals to have any input into how others see them. The hint of a social constructionist caveat offered by DS does not extend that far; it only speaks to self-expressions that may change with circumstances. As such, race itself is described as something that is rigid in nature, as it is a specific identification that does not change.
Moreover, the racial categories cited are uncritically and unreflectively adopted from the US census, and are treated as a matter of fact. In this way, these US organisations implicitly align their everyday views of race with the historical views of race evidenced throughout the census. The census not only heavily relies on biological paradigms of race, but has also developed a language to describe the different recognised races in the United States that have gone unquestioned in the use of these organisations in their articulations of race. Where the organisations do challenge the US Census Bureau is the lack of official acknowledgment of people who have ancestry from two or more of the rigid categories developed (and accepted by these organisations), as examined in the previous chapter.

Remarkably, in regard to their ongoing relationship with the state, the primary aims of these two organisations are grounded in the acceptance of the biological categories of the US Census Bureau—the same organisation against which they battle legally for multiracial categorisation.

In Britain, there are also examples of biological race paradigms used by mixed race organisations. XP, who runs an educational support group to promote positive mixed race discussion and identities for schoolchildren, gives an example of the specific demographic he works with in his organisation:

XP: So, for example, some people might say that all Jamaicans are mixed race, but I’m not talking about their actual heritage mix. I’m talking about a lived experience within the UK where one person will have a White and a non-White parent. But you could have a Black African and a Black Jamaican parent, but I wouldn’t consider that child to be mixed race because their experiences are both within the same racial group.

Relying on reified notions of racialisation, XP explicitly rejects historical heritage mixture as leading to what he calls the same “lived experience” that having two differently racialised parents does for British people today. Interestingly, XP does not negate social elements of race completely; indeed, he cites “lived experience” as being an important part of racial identity in the above quote—and thus, inclusion as mixed race. However, he is sceptical that different types of mixtures (in this
example, historical ancestry or official British census sub-groupings\textsuperscript{12) lead to similar or comparable “lived experiences” as those who are racialised as being mixed.

XP added that “…[T]he students I come across are identifiably mixed race, in that they do not have mono-heritage parents.” Not only does he continue to stress his firm ideology of biological racialisation as an important signifier of the students he works with, but also when describing some of his organisation’s goals, he mentioned that one part was trying to increase “physical representation within schools” of “mixed race identity” (XP). This aim is another example of the way that external appearances form an important part of mixed race definition for some organisations. For these organisations, representations of people who “look like me,” is deemed important as a way of inclusion and acceptance. This idea of a mixed race phenotype, however, may work to reify an idea of what a mixed race person “looks like”; as when considering all the backgrounds that could possibly make up mixedness, the diversity in what these organisations are attempting to qualify is too wide to capture into a representative figure or two.

XP limits his operationalisation of mixed race to those who have parents from two different racial groups; unambiguously stating the specific situation where one parent is White and the other is non-White. Despite acknowledging what “some people” say about mixture among Jamaicans or having parents that would be categorised under different sub-groupings of a British ethnicity category, XP states clearly that he does not consider that mixed race. Presumably, for him, there is an external, “lived experience” distinction between people who have parents of different racial categories (as XP defines them) than multigenerational mixture, which may include mixture among census sub-categories.

\textsuperscript{12} The Ethnicity question on the 2001 England and Wales Census offers five main ethnicity categories with sub-group options that additionally specify nation-, region, or (in the case of Mixed), race- or continent of ancestral origin. In the instance referred to by the interviewee for the main ethnic group \textit{Black or Black British}, the sub-categories offered are \textit{Caribbean}, \textit{African}, or \textit{Any other Black background}. 
XP explains that this distinction is determined by a “lived experience” that is connected to having parents from two racial groups; something that is not experienced by people who have parents from different ethnicities or cultures that are still categorised as being in the same racialised group in Great Britain. For XP, just as “racial groups” are linked to biological differences, “lived experience” is also connected to biology. During our conversation, he recalled that the young people in his organisation used “mixed race” to describe their “experience from two different parent[s’ races].” Again, “(lived) experience” is usually used as a social term, but in the case of this organisation, it is being “biologised” in that it is directly referring to components of biological race. It is not being used as a critique on biological notions of race or as a social constructionist approach to explore mixed race. Rather, it is expressed as a rather objective feature that is definitive of mixed race itself.

Similar to XP, LJ (GB), who also works to promote positive (“Black-White”) mixed identity among other advocacy and community aims, appeals to a biological paradigm of race to articulate her specific definition of mixed race. As she explains:

LJ: …[F]or the purposes of trying to reach the people we want to reach, we see mixed race as anybody who has parents from two different races. Not parents who are necessarily from two different countries; that is what I term as “dual heritage.” But mixed race is parents from two different races.

LJ distinguishes between the meaning she places on race and country of origin vis-à-vis mixture. Similarly to XP, she gives an example that excludes parentage from different countries that do not encompass racial differences as she constructs them. As she explores this further, she begins to make a distinction between aspects of difference based on origin; and external, or phenotypic, differences.

LJ: …I think “heritage” relates to property, that you’re more or less inheriting something and we do not, you know, as far as I’m concerned, “dual heritage” or, you know, “mixed heritage” can relate to people who are just from different countries or say somebody English who moves to America…. [T]hey’ve got their English heritage and they’re now going to acquire a new one in America.

LJ does not seem to put the same social importance on the two distinctions as XP does. For her, what she is labelling “heritage” (a national label related to origin or
residency) is merely something one “inherits.” She uses this word to imply that the concept or label of “heritage” is passed down but has little social consequence. Likening it to “property”; it is as if she is comparing it to something that is concrete and stable, lifeless, and relatively taken for granted in the British (and USA) contexts (Scott and Marshall 2009). It describes to a certain extent where a person may be from or where they may live, but it does not go much further than that. This type of heritage does not encapsulate external appearances, and it does not describe cultural distinctions, either, from how LJ describes her perspective. Because of her perspective on the way she understands “heritage,” she does not see the benefit of focusing on the mixture of heritage, as it does not specifically address the real issue, which for her, is what she constructs as “race.”

LJ returns to speaking specifically about phenotype as markers for racial difference. She draws upon her own phenotypic associations with Black mixture and she reflects that:

LJ: …[P]eople treat you a certain way because you’re going to look a certain way. You can be mixed in other ways and not look, you know, not particularly look like your, you know, non-European racial background, but if you are Black and White mix, you tend to have Black features or Black hair, etc., so people can identify quickly that you have some Black in you and people will then treat you in a certain way because of that.

LJ speaks somewhat generally and yet, still at times quite pointedly about phenotypes and the ways that she associates them to different racial groups. Speaking generally, she asserts someone who she considers mixed race may not “look like” they have a “non-European” background. However, appearances would only include the non-specified and assumed criteria used to distinguish biological race, which leaves them highly subjective in nature. On the other hand, when speaking about Black mixture and associated phenotypic markers (i.e., “Black features, Black hair, etc.” as well as having “some Black in you”), the examples were specific and listed as though they were objective and uniform across all racialised Black populations. Within this particular application of the biological race
paradigm, there is an internal incongruity, in that it claims to be objective in distinguishing racial categories, but the criteria for organizing the racial categories are subjective and often unspecific and based on assumptions.

In addition to phenotype as a way of understanding race, LJ also reflects explicitly and implicitly on “racism” as part of her constructions of race and mixed race. Before the above portion of the interview, she emphatically states that, “[A]s far as I’m concerned, racism still exists and as long as racism exists, you can’t get rid of the word ‘race,’ because you always have to draw attention to it.” Considering this context, a connection becomes more clear between her concerns about treatment based on phenotype and her constructions of race based on phenotype. She touches on the notion of “passing” for some of those constructed as mixed race, but says that for those with Black mixture, it is more difficult because of the phenotypic associations she attaches to Black mixture. As such, racism will feature as part of the consequence for having specific sets of phenotypic characteristics, as they differ from those constructed to be of the majority racial group. In this way, she links a type of social consequence (racism) to phenotypic differentiations as a way of supporting her biological racial paradigm.

Phenotype and racism are important themes around the biological construction of mixed race for LJ. As she continues talking through the phenotypic implications of mixed race and racism, she gives a more practical example of how this might affect someone she would define as mixed race:

LJ: …I think it’s really important that when children are growing up that they have the influence of both races if they are mixed race and this brings problems, you know? Say you’ve been brought up by one parent and that parent may not, they may not understand the importance of you having a balanced um, you know, cultural upbringing. So, for instance if your one parent is European and you only ever learn about the European culture and you don’t learn about your, your other parent’s culture, it, it won’t really matter when you’re very young, but

13 “[Passing] usually refers to the attempt of a person of mixed ancestry to be accepted as part of a dominant white group, but other types of passing are possible, too” (Hernández-Campoy and Conde-Silvestre 2012: 357).
as you start to get older and you start to, um, establish as sense of identity, you’re going to come across problems, because society will always see you as a certain way. And, you know, if you have no ammunition, you have no tools to deal with, say racism, um, from both sides of your background, then it’s going to cause you a lot of problems. […] And, you know, it’s not necessarily, you know, just a Black and White thing.

Here, LJ gives a reason why those that she constructs as racially mixed should have a cognizance of their mixedness. In her example she shifts between the ideas of culture and race, ultimately speaking about culture as race. She gives an example of a mixed race child being brought up by a “European” parent. In the scenario, the child is only exposed to “European culture” and not the other parent’s “culture.” But, in fact, she is using “European” as a proxy word for the racialised concept of Whiteness. Within the context she is speaking, “European” has little specificity or meaning in terms of language, dress, or other forms of common cultural markers. On the contrary, the term is being used as a homogenising stand-in for race, as referenced to at the beginning of the excerpt. When LJ begins to speak about “identity,” it seems as if she could be speaking again about culture on the surface, but then she begins referencing physical appearance, racism, and ultimately race again; thus supporting that she likely was speaking about race all along. “Other,” or non-European—in reference to parentage—are not any type of discernible cultural grouping. However, if she is speaking of race, this fits neatly into the common biological race binary of White/Other; or White/Black, which incidentally is referenced at the end of the excerpt. When speaking about identity, she contrasts this with “society will always see you as a certain way”; a supposition she problematises. Rather than this contrast inferring identity as a cultural process that includes many social elements, it actually limits it, in a literal way, to how a person is viewed—appearance, phenotype, and race.

LJ also makes a distinction between the mixture of race and other forms of mixture—in this case, nation of origin. This follows her focus on the salience of race in Britain and the importance of race for her particular organisation. For her, it is important to maintain a distinction between “race” and other forms of cultural difference.
NW (GB), in slight contrast, acknowledged an uncertainty in how she and her organisation conceptualise mixed race, especially when starting her grassroots group to provide support to mixed race individuals and families. Here, she describes the first pilot meeting of her group:

NW: …I think there were something like, about three Black dads and there were two sort of mixed race dads, and then there was one Black father and then the rest were all, it was that kind of that breakdown. And actually, what we did discover and particularly face-to-face because at this stage, you’ve got to remember we were still naïve in our understanding of what mixed parentage was about or what our concept of how we felt, you know, mixed race was.

For NW, her work with the organisation she represents is a “journey,” and this includes her own conceptions of mixed race and the ones developed within the context of her group. It was the participants who showed up that helped to develop her ideas and conceptions of mixed race. In this particular account, in addition to the racial descriptions mentioned above, she goes on to describe a “White” family that also showed up to the first meeting. After asking them about why they were interested in attending the group meeting, they shared their mixed racial and ethnic backgrounds and subsequent experiences. As NW described it, the mother in this family explained that although she appeared White, she had “African or Indian blood in her.” She and one of her siblings had been “very white,” and another sibling was “a light brown colour.” She explained to the group that because of the different looks and experiences she had growing up within her family by people in the community, she was always conscious of her own mixed status. The mother further explained that her husband was White, and they had adopted children together with varying backgrounds and phenotypes, and they did not want their children to lose their identities either, especially when they looked more White and had parents who looked White.

The “journey” ethos, in terms of conceptualising mixed race, allows for flexibility and fluidity as members attend and share their backgrounds and stories. One of the outcomes of the pilot group was noting who attended, what their backgrounds were, and why they were interested in the group. As the group continues to meet,
NW stresses that this pilot meeting helped to develop her own and the organisation’s working definitions of mixed race to extend to a concept that goes beyond obvious physical appearances and specific racial categories.

The last specified element of mixed race operationalisation was one of relative subjectivity, in that mixed race came down to a sense of personal identity. FT (GB) also expressed that mixed race is about “how people view themselves.” XP speaks about mixed race as “being something you feel or you don’t.” Interestingly, this seems potentially contradictory with his conceptions of mixed race quoted above as being specific to racialisation (having a White parent and a non-White parent) and not inclusive of mixedness within racialised categories, as some people may “feel” mixed race with other types of mixed backgrounds, as expressed by some of the other respondents. Yet, on some level, he must also allow for personal identification and “feeling” to be included in his operational usage of mixed race.

In the operationalisation of mixed race for the organisations, there is more rigidity about conceptions about mixed race found for the US organisations than for the organisations in Britain, generally speaking. While the conceptions of mixed race remained closely around “race” categories, some organisations in Britain expand their understanding of biological mixed race and relevant issues to those with other forms of mixed backgrounds, including having parentage from different nations, cultures, and other forms of diversity.

*Mixedness through Generations*

Although on the surface, the organisations to which I spoke gave very similar answers to the question of “What is mixed race?” it quickly becomes clear that beneath the surface, the organisations have different and distinct concepts of the term. An area where this is especially contentious is in the area of mixedness throughout generations, which is the idea of acknowledging racialised mixture beyond immediate parentage. This is significant because in more recent critical mixed race theorisation, multigenerational mixedness has been a particular salient issue for criticising the constructions of mixedness by mixed race organisations.
HJ (US) is part of a network that organises around “Black-White” mixed race specifically. The organisations that she runs include an education and training group for parents of mixed race children and a socialising network for mixed race adults. In addition to mixed race referring to having parentage of two different ("socially-defined") races, she, unlike XP and LJ above, talks about “multigenerational” mixed race. She defines this as “their parents are not of two different races. Maybe it’s their grandparents or great grandparents.”

Here, she specifically acknowledges mixedness through generations, which is not a common focus for mixed race organisations or on surveys that ask for racialised classification from a list of official options. She does make a “distinction” to indicate that there is a difference in her mind about the identity and experiential conceptions of multigenerational mixed race from the identity and experiential conceptions of a person who has parents from two or more different racial categories. However, there is contradictory racialised logic in this distinction, as the parents in question who have mixed race parents (the “grandparents” in her example) would then be mixed race, by her own definition. As the organisations in which HJ is involved primarily focus on “Black-White” mixedness, perhaps she assumes that the two mixed race parents would be of the “same (mixed) race.” However, as mentioned previously when discussing mixed race representation, there is diversity within the “mixed race” that has been constructed by these organisations that goes both beyond the categories of “Black” and “White”; as well as the racial heritages that parents, grandparents, etc., may have.

When examining it further, to her, there is even more nuance in multigenerational mixed race around identity and familiarity with ethno-racial ancestry. To further explain, she added:

HJ: I think there’s a distinction….[I]t’s very different than, “Well, you know, I’m claiming my Whiteness from somebody back when I don’t know.” Or, “I’m claiming my Blackness—“ …[O]r, what White people do, “I’m claiming my Native American. Don’t know what tribe or what ancestor, but hey, I’m Native American. You know? I would say, “You’re a White
boy.” Right? But, people can identify the way they want to, that being said.

In her explanation, there is significance in knowing the specifics of one’s racialised backgrounds in claiming a mixed identity, and great scepticism around those who “claim” a mixed background without knowing the specifics of their racialised heritages. In her statement, she links the knowledge of one’s background with his or her personal identity, lived experience, and racialised socialisation. There is assumption in her statement about the ancestral distance of the racialised mixing and hypodescent, in that a person can be categorised as one race when not much is known about ancestry some generations past. For her, mixed race is not purely about background, but is tied into a conscious understanding about that background.

HJ then reiterates that “people can identify the way they want to.” This seems contradictory to her criticisms of those who do not know the specifics of their racialised heritage who, regardless, acknowledge its presence in their assertions of racialised background. Whilst the assertion is not necessary equivalent to personal identity, it does appear that HJ would not accept people comparable to her examples as multigenerational mixed race, even if they identified as such. From what she has said, it is reasonable to conclude that identity as multigenerational mixed race requires a knowledge and understanding of ancestry that has a fairly recent mixed race lineage.

CD (US), from a group that advocates for a mixed race category, also speaks about (multigenerational) mixed race parentage as being inclusive in her conception of mixed race.

CD: I would define a mixed race or multiracial individual as someone who is of two or more distinct racial groups. This would include children of multiracial parents.

CD is less critical and nuanced in her ideas of race and subsequently her conception of mixed race, as she accepts that there are objective and discrete racial categories. Her organisation is one that advocates for an additional racial category for mixed race people, which makes her stance on multiracial parentage
interesting, with regard to hypodescent. A child of two people from the proposed
“Multiracial” racial category, according to CD, would fall into a paradox, as the child
would not be mixed race when considering her definition of having parents from two
distinct racialised groups. However, at the same time, the child would be
considered “Multiracial” because the parents are “Multiracial.” For her, these
distinctions do not consider life experience or cultural elements, and is a
categorisation based on an assumed objectivity of race and the idea that “one is
what one’s parents are.” In this way, CD and HJ are distinctive in their inclusions of
mixed race parentage and lineage despite them both acknowledging it as part of
their mixed race definitions.

Generally, my interviews have shown that there is a wider scope for notions of
mixed race among the organisations in Britain than in the USA. There is
considerable variety in the mixedness each organisation acknowledges in their
conceptions of mixed race. In a comparable way to her counterparts discussed in
the previous section, JC—who works with diverse families in inner-city London—
specifically includes mixed race in past generations in her conception of mixed
race.

JC: I think the technical term is when you have two parents from
different races…but that could be…first generation, [or the]
next generation. I think it’s a very muddy kind of issue, where
you’ll get some kinds of mixed race…that will know actually
where [they come from] completely.

JC exposes a limit to her definitions of mixed race as she contrasts the “technical”
terminology with how it is operationalised in her understanding and in her work with
her organisation by including “next generation” in her definition.

In summary, when considering mixedness through generations, the organisations in
the US and Britain that spoke about it diverged greatly in their constructions of it. In
the US, the organisations were wary of it, in that they mentioned it as special cases.
CD allows for the children of mixed race parents to be included in her construction
of mixed race, though the question remains: how far in one’s heritage would this
apply? Contrary to CD’s inclusivity as “also mixed race,” HJ makes a special
distinction for what she calls “multigenerational” mixed race, where she negates the mixedness of parentage or heritage further back in the lineage due to the potential experiences people may have with these circumstances. In Britain, the organisations readily constructed broad views of mixedness that went beyond strictly biologised racialisation.

“Race is a social construction, but....”

In addition to the outlined cases in the previous section where race was being constructed in relatively straightforward biological paradigms, TN (US), who cultivates mixed race communities, has a different way of understanding race through a paradigm that has social and biological elements. Unlike DS, CD, XP, and LJ; TN rejects “race” as a contemporary terminology. When exploring race specifically, he explains:

TN: …[T]he keyword in there is “race.” So race is a social construct. It has no scientific basis, so if you buy into race, you buy into a social construct. ...[I]f we are talking about race, we are...with an eye to the past.... [...] ...[Y]ou have to buy into the categories of race, which are sort of false to begin with. So, if you buy into those categories, mixed race...would mean...an individual whose parents belong to different racial categories, as they’ve been artificially defined.... Um, that’s sort of the strict interpretation of it. I think it’s funny because “race” is pejorative and at the same time, it’s the sort of “Yankee Doodle” effect. Okay, you’re going to put us in different boxes? And do this? Well, guess what! I’m proud of it, like, being mixed race. You know what I mean? So, there’s a positive side, too.

At a superficial level, it would seem that TN is rejecting race as a biological concept with his proclamation that “race is a social construct.” With that phrase, he also negates the “truth” of race by dismissing it as being false and artificial. However, (putting aside his point about “no scientific basis” momentarily), when he explains more what he means by that, he links the notion of “social construct” to the past14. When his organisation engages around race, he says that they do so “with an eye to the past” and that race has a “‘Yankee Doodle’ effect”; a US American reference

14 Alluding to the significant racial history of the US, including slavery, segregation, internment, exclusion acts, and other forms of legalised and illegal discrimination.
that conjures up colonial/early post-colonial America, and by associative context
the lack of civil rights for racialised minorities of the time. Also within this context,
race is “pejorative”; requiring external judgement and categorisation that may not
reflect an individual’s preferences. Whilst TN appears to be rejecting the notion of
race in the present, he stops short of doing so in the past; his implication being that
it played a more “real” role in society before.

TN also suggests that in addition to his associating it with the past, part of what
makes race a “social construct” is that it does not have scientific merit. He has a
different attitude when he speaks about “ethnicity.” Taking more affinity to the
word, TN describes his take on ethnicity:

TN: Ethnicity, I think, is a little bit more, um, legitimate or
something? …[R]ace is a construct; like, totally fake. Ethnicity
is more based on things that you can actually back up with
science or observation. Different cultural groupings, I guess.
It’s sort of tough; it’s a complex topic. It’s not easy to sort of
pin it down. But it’s sort of like the overlapping of genetic and
cultural influences that’s sort of how you form ethnicity….

TN declares a legitimacy to “ethnicity” that he does not find applicable to “race.” In
the way that he discusses “ethnicity” in direct contrast to “race,” it appears as
though he is able to do so largely by replacing the word “race” with “ethnicity,”
distinctive from his other US-based counterparts. The two words have different
historical usages, which are reflected in the ways that TN speaks about them. For
TN, “race” has connotations based in the past, whereas “ethnicity” has more
contemporary relevance for him. Once the word “race” is shifted to “ethnicity,” then
TN easily describes an accepted concept that is partly based on biological notions
of race that he appeared to be rejecting in his earlier narrative.

Additionally, reiterated in the latter quotation, the concept of race for TN is a “social
construct” because it is “totally fake” and has “no scientific basis.” Yet, there is a
contradiction in his approach to “legitimacy” with regard to a sociological notion of
social construction that would negate biological race paradigms. What legitimises
“ethnicity” as a meaningful concept for TN is the way that he uses it to biologise
and racialise groups via “science or observation” in ways that he denies “race” does
in the present. By evoking science, observation, and genetics, he refers to similar methods used by the other groups above who also rely on biological racialisation to construct race and determine groupings based on their constructed criteria. Despite his uncertainty of the connotation, TN does seem to have a clear idea of ethnicity as he employs elements of heritage (genetics/science) and culture (observation).

“We are all a part of one big human mixed race family....”

Generally, the mixed race community organisations agreed on a definition of mixed race as “having parents of two different races.” However, there were cases in both the United States and Britain where a few of the organisations expressed some scepticism around “race,” and revealed a desire to move away from the term and/or the concept altogether.

These views are the closest to a “post-race” paradigm. They generally were expressed in two ways: either that all individuals belong to the “human race” or that each individual has racialised mixture and therefore race is an irrelevant social categorisation. In a way, these two positions appear to come to a similar conclusion that race, and the processes and outcomes of racialisations, are social phenomena rather than biological ones. However, the nuances in the thoughts behind these perspectives show that they are indeed quite different from each other. As such, the desired outcomes of putting forward such post-race positions within the organisations and the ways by which they arrive at them are important to examine further.

Beginning with NW (GB), she expressed the dislike of hers and the members of her organisation of the idea of race:

NW: …[T]hrough a discussion that we had with the families...the conversation or debate came up about...the word “race,” and a lot of families agreed that actually...to be mixed race means that you, you’re kind of separating yourself from the human race, so-to-speak...we’re all part of the human race....

In her articulation is somewhat of a critique of race as being something that separates human beings (as a singular “race”); in a sense ascribing difference that
is not actually there. Although she does not use the “social construct” terminology of some of the other respondents, her articulation perhaps goes further than the mere term to explain why racial categorisation does not sit well with her and her group, and to touch on the social elements behind race that do not make sense to them. This perspective aligns with “colourblind” ideologies whereby in attempts to move beyond race, the social reality of racialised discrimination is downplayed or ignored (Wise 2010). As NW and the members of her group focus greatly on issues such as belonging and isolation, not to mention utilise racialised language to describe themselves and others, this would suggest that this articulated notion of a unified human race is a form of idealisation.

Perhaps another perspective with similar meaning, but with different framing, is the way TN (US) chooses to speak about his organisation and its participants as part of a “multicultural community.” Rejecting race as a “social construct,” and proposing “ethnicity” as a term more “legitimate,” he goes on to say:

TN: To us, culture is the most easiest or the most salient attribute, you know? It’s a little bit more useful and kind of definable. Let’s put it this way: say, we just screened [the film] Mississippi Masala and you know, the main character is Indian descent that grew up in Uganda, moved to the UK and moved to the US. […] Most of the characters identify as Ugandan but they are not from Uganda, genetically speaking, so that’s culture. It’s an easier way to address that. But not [that] they don’t have cultural attributes that came from India, too. You know what I mean? Ethnically, they are from India, culturally they are from India, Uganda, and then later in like UK, US. So our mission statement, we say that we are trying to build multicultural community. So to us, the idea of culture is…one of the best ways to define the positive things that define us as human beings. […] It has that flexibility built into it. You know, it’s portable. It’s transferable. […] Culture is traditions and customs and stuff. […] So, when we are saying multicultural community, we are saying that we’re encouraging an exchange between cultures.

Instead of using colourblind rhetoric, TN uses “multicultural” as a way to move away from racialisation and ethnicity alone in order to capture an element of the lived experience that results from being part of various, diverse cultural communities. For TN, racialised designations fit into that, but the term “multicultural” goes beyond
that to something more practical in his mind ("salient", "useful," and "definable"). In contrast to DS and CD (both US), who take a more restrictive stance on terminology, TN uses his terminology to be more inclusive and open about mixedness.

Following his stance on multicultural community articulated above, TN refrains from using "multiethnic" to describe his organisations communities, as he views the term as referring solely to how he’s explained “ethnic background”—as one of national origin. He links the term in people’s minds to “multiracial relationships,” which is not what he wants to convey with “multicultural community.” For him and his organisation, “multiethnic” or “multiracial” relationships should not face obstacles by society, but they are not “pushing” or encouraging them in their work. By using “multicultural community,” those people in partnerships across racialised designations are included among other forms of cultural diversity welcomed by the group.

Taking these points together, TN desires to shift from a focus solely on race and ethnicity. He suggests that “race” and “ethnicity” divide people into nations or specific types of relationships comprised of specific categories of people, which he views despairingly. Instead, he wants to encourage a notion of community (singular) where all people are welcomed and encouraged to share their social differences within the context of a community. This is the opposite of colourblind ideology; differences are not obscured but are celebrated. The notion of a singular community of which all can be part is very similar to NW’s thoughts that everyone belongs to the same human race. In both articulations, the negative repercussions of racialisation and racialised categories are negated for a sense of oneness—whether real or imagined. Though there is acknowledged room in TN’s vision for social diversity within his community, just as there is articulated diversity within NW’s group, both are reluctant to focus on race—specifically the mixed race and ethnicity around which their organisations focus in these statements. In this way, they reflect elements of post-race paradigms that have “moved beyond race” as a salient category (Neblett 2011; Wise 2010).
Shifting now to the second post-race articulation, mixed race is seen commonly by my respondents as something that everybody is, in the end. However, most of the time this articulation is an offhand comment that is followed incongruously by specific ideas of what “mixed race” means for particular organisations in practice, both in the United States and in Britain. One respondent speaks in notable contrast to this, however. Labelling the term as “socio-political,” GH (US) begins by carefully acknowledging the role of census categories in his articulation of mixed race:

GH: …[I]t depends on the country you’re in, in the United States, it’s anyone whose parents cross traditional Census Bureau categories.

By citing the country and the Census Bureau as sources for racial categories, GH shows his consciousness of a link between the state and people in social processes; in particular, the role that the state plays in designating racialised categories and the public’s adoption of those categories as meaningful for themselves. This was unique for my respondents, as there was no other respondent who articulated a link to the state in their understanding of racial difference.

He continued on with this personal opinion:

GH: Ultimately, we’re all mixed race. I think all these terms are socio-political, so you can throw them around forever if you want. It depends on the society. […] Most countries have, uh, single words for mixed race anyway, so you don’t need, uh, you know, a dual word for it. Because it is clear that until we get to a, uh, position where we don’t discuss race…we’ve got to do something. And the best thing to describe, in my mind, populations that we encounter is people with many different racial or many different ethnic backgrounds, that’s multi—more than two—and it shows more than one.

Out of all of the organisations interviewed, GH is the most vehement about articulating his post-race position. In this case, his use of racial categories is a pragmatic one, he articulates. He uses them out of a sense of necessity, but that usage does not reflect his personal or organisational perspectives on mixed race. The quote above begins by arguing that everyone is “mixed race,” which assumes that everyone has parentage that crosses US Census racial classifications. This is a
commonly-held notion uttered by the mixed race organisations I interviewed and follows along generalised post-racial thinking. In contrast and taking it further, however, he argues the socially constructed nature of race, of which a post-race paradigm is also part. However, he gives examples from other nations on how they have taken to labelling populations that have been racialised as mixed, which he uses as examples to solve the mixed race “problem.” However, having racial categories for different “official” mixes departs in logic from his earlier assertions that everyone is mixed race. Nonetheless, throughout the interview, he speaks about ending public discourses on race, and here is no exception—ultimately, he sees the way forward on dealing with “race” is to move forward from it.

Yet, within his adamant denial of the salience or even existence of mixed race, and despite his explanation for the necessity of terminology until the “end of race,” he often slips into the use of racialised language that does not sound critical. An example of this can be seen in the quote above at the end, where he speaks of people with different racial or ethnic groups in a way where he is not problematising race, but is using it in a rather straightforward way, much like the way he opens the quote stating matter-of-factly that we are all mixed race. This could be due the difficulty of speaking about the social concept or construction of mixed race without either avoiding the language that is often used within the common discourses, or using cumbersome language to explain more approximately what one means every time a racialised concept is invoked.

I find a tension throughout GH’s accounts of mixed race, as he lays out his post-race viewpoints. Whilst he is advocating for a paradigm of post-race that limits the focus on racialised discourse as a salient biological and eventually social concept, I do not believe that he completely dismisses race as either sort of construction, as he articulates in his interview. His reliance on the “we’re all mixed race” foundation is problematic if he does not truly believe in racialised categories, as then “mixed race” has no meaning, biological or otherwise. Instead of speaking more to that, he speaks about how in other countries, they have different labels for the same concept, which does work to challenge and disrupt the rigid categorical
structures present in the United States. But he stops short of negating these other
terms as also being ones socially constructed for those specific states; instead he
favours terms that do not rely on using a prefix that implies mixture to describe
populations. In this example, the focus becomes no longer on problematising the
social construction of mixed race, but rather problematising the labels applied to
people racialised as mixed race (in the United States).

Despite these tensions, GH’s views are consistent with some post-race paradigms.
In his summation of the persistent problem of race, he tells me:

GH: …[Y]ou’re probably going to kill me for this, but I think one of
the reasons why we’re so focused on race is we have what I
call a “sociological view” of populations, and one of the
sociological views is to put everything into these groups. And
I advocate—and I think we’re going to begin to do that—is to
move more towards a “psychological view” of people. Back
to the individual and back to what attributes does an individual
have, including race. But not just race—so that we are all
multifaceted and belong to a variety of groups, not just one.
[…] And I think we’re slowly going to get to that because
people are getting sick and tired of this notion of you’re just
categorizing this wonderful complex thing called the human
being into one group; that makes no sense.

GH’s “psychological view” of populations does not aim to eliminate the notion of
race (thus perhaps further indicating that GH does not go so far as to deny
biological race or argue that it is does not exist). Instead, he contrasts it to his
notion of a “sociological view” of populations that positions race to be a primary
essentialising social category at the expense of other types of social and individual
groupings. Elsewhere in the interview, GH speaks of how a “psychological view”
and the elimination of the focus on racial groups will help to shift advocacy to focus
on “needs” not necessarily tied to the essence of being mixed race.

GH’s preference for his “psychological view” is similar to a post-race paradigm that
allows for being “rooted in, but not restricted by” a socially constructed racial group
(Neblett 2011: 12). Neblett’s view allows for the acknowledgement of the social
construction of mixed race, in this case, but also advocates for other types of group
identifications. However, GH’s position is not identical to that set out by Neblett,
because GH would eventually like to eliminate racial categorisation. As a pragmatic decision, GH articulates that he uses categories presently only because the state continues to use them. Thus, GH also has a post-race stance that overlaps with the argument that race no longer exists. GH’s post-race framework lies in tension between these two positions.

**CONCLUSION**

I have, in this chapter, explored the ways that meso-level racial projects utilise the intragroup mechanisms outlined in Chapter Five to form constructions of mixedness within their groups. Unlike the external mechanisms utilised primarily to create and contest notions of mixed race that engage with macro-level bodies, mixed race groups rely upon intragroup mechanisms to create and inhabit constructions of mixedness within and through their local communities. As seen in the examples from Britain, the organisations run by NW and LJ are two examples where community is a primary goal. In the case of NW, constructions are created through members’ relationship with one another, while for LJ, her own conceptions of mixedness are the starting place, through which others can contribute through shared ideas of idioculture.

HJ in the US bases her group on her own social interests. She uses strategies of social identity and social capital to grow her community, which, similar to NW, is based on conceptions of racialised self-identity requirements. However, in contrasts to NW, the group was not founded on notions of isolation, but rather on being social to be social and have a good time with other, like-minded people. In this way, the constructions created and reinforced through HJ’s organisations do not rely on idiocultural practices as LJ’s does, as HJ does not utilise discourse as a basis for organising.

After analysing the strategies meso-level organisation use to construct mixed race, I turned my analysis to the substance of the mixed race constructions. The concept of “mixed race” is constructed in varying ways by the different organisations that I interviewed in the United States and Britain, which reflects the ways that historical
and social influences and everyday understandings of individuals and group participants understand, describe, and conceptualise race. At times, the different organisations overlap in their articulations, whilst at others, they oppose and contradict each other.

Throughout the interviews, the respondents articulated their descriptions and conceptions of mixed race in ways that corresponded to three race paradigms: biological, social, and post-race. No articulation fit firmly into just one theory, but rather pulled from more than one at different points. The first theme of the chapter did focus specifically on biological articulations of mixed race. For DS and CD (both from the USA), who give clear articulations that are mostly biological in nature, there is some leeway articulated for those who can express their race “socially” in certain circumstances. Although not articulated in the same ways explicitly, most organisations in the US tended to rely on biological notions of race. This is in spite of whether they acknowledged some social elements in their racial understandings. In the British articulations, while both XP and LJ speak about favouring a type of biological mixedness as their target group, they engage with other types of mixedness and attempt to explain why they are not inclined to include those who do not have a “lived experience” of mixed race—in other words, are not racialised as mixed, even if they may have racialised mixture in their past lineage. The other side had some organisations expressing that mixed race was down to how a person feels or personally identifies, without any other criteria. This perspective is social in nature, in that—in its articulation, at least—it does not rely on any biology to define racial categories.

When race is articulated as a “social construct,” the language that follows from the organisations is often biological. In his racialisation of the term “ethnicity,” TN quite clearly speaks in biological terms about how it is scientific and observable. As other groups merely utter that race is a “social construct,” TN shows that he does understand the concept of social construction to some extent in saying that race has no scientific basis. Yet, when he substitutes “ethnicity” for “race,” he supports the biologised concept he attempts to negate.
The post-race perspectives share the idea that in some way, society has moved on from race, whether it be that all people should be seen as human beings, that race is an irrelevant categorisation, or that race can be acknowledged without definition. Even within these strands, biology is referenced both to identify participants as “mixed race” and to refer to that from which needs moving on. In the case of GH, he argues both for the end of racial categories and the acknowledgement of race as well as other social groupings. In both of these, as he is arguing for a movement beyond race, he relies on biological notions of race as a basis from which to move forward.

With some exception, mixed race organisations in the United States tended to rely upon biological and cultural notions to construct essences of mixed race, even when they articulated a belief of social constructionism. Organisations based in Britain tended to approach mixed race as a more fluid conception that is based on post-race ideas influence by colourblind approaches. When comparing the difference in biological focus between the United States and the United Kingdom, David Mason writes:

> A key reason for this difference of emphasis probably lies in the greater visibility of “race” as a political and administrative category in the United States. In this connection it clearly denotes phenotypical [sic] difference and may well help to reinforce popular biological conceptions which the authors even of sociological texts feel the need to address.


Here, he highlights academic writers, however this may extend also to mixed race organisers, who—in the case of the interviewees—also may be either academics or educators themselves, or at least more familiar with scholarly work than the general public. The political and administrative aspects of racialised categorisation in the United States were present throughout the interviews with the US-based organisations, especially in the cases when they worked specifically to advocate for administrative categories against political bodies, such as the US Census Bureau.
The converse of the Mason quote helps to explain why the British organisations may not have been as fixated on categorisation overall, thus allowing them to be more exploratory about their constructions of mixed race. The two British organisations that had a focus on “Black-White” mixed race (represented by XP and LJ) tended to rely on biological racialised paradigms more than the British organisations that focus on mixedness generally. Perhaps this makes sense, in that as there is some sense of specificity (particularly for the group run by LJ), some forms of criteria were articulated as the organisers spoke about their participants. These groups that relied on biological paradigms also were the ones that preferred “race” in their terminology, which for them implied biological (specifically racialised) requirements.

The remaining British organisations had a more fluid approach to mixed race. This was reflected in their openness both towards group membership, as well as their own thinking about how they spoke about mixed race as being more than firm, objective definitions based on biological race. They spoke of their scepticism of fixed labels and gave examples of group members who did not fit “traditional” ideas of mixed race who also desired the same support/education/advocacy as those with “identifiable” racialised mixedness. For them, the fixed biological labels were too limiting for the purposes of their work, and found it more useful and practical to be more open to the people who opted in to their services.

In spite of the various strategies used to understand and articulate race, the underpinning of biologised and culturised understandings present throughout all the organisations makes clear the pervasiveness of these long-rejected ideas. Understanding the ways in which mixed race organisations construct mixed race is important because it helps to show the specific ways that racial paradigms are at work presently. It is one thing to read about the shifts of racial paradigms in scholarly literature, but as analysing the above interview data has shown, the implementation of the paradigms is neither discrete nor straightforward. Examining racial paradigms empirically helps to understand how understandings of race are being operationalised in the everyday context. However, further, it can help to
develop and refine these paradigms in ways that may be more useful when analysing similar organisations, as well as in their application more widespread.
Chapter Seven: Conclusion

Chapter Overview

United States and Britain have seen the rise of mixed race discourse that celebrates the increasing prevalence of mixed race personal and social identities. This mixed race moment of the twenty-first century raises interesting questions about the ways that mixed race is constructed and the mechanisms used to do so. The main goal of my thesis was to examine the ways that the national censuses and mixed race organisations in the United States and Britain construct mixed race. I sought to analyse both the ways that macro-level and meso-level racial projects in each nation described and conceptualised mixed race. Moreover, I also examined the ways that both levels of organisations engage with each other in order to contest and/or accept mixed race constructions through racial formation. Through this systematic cross-national comparative study, my aim has been to provide insight into the particular national-specific processes that contribute to the divergent notions of racialised mixedness in the United States and Britain.

Racial formation theory was developed by Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1986, 1994, 2015) in order to examine racialisation processes within and between macro-level and micro-level racial projects. I have proposed the addition of the meso-level racial project in order to examine the racialisation processes that occur at the relational group level. The preceding chapters have analysed the salient themes and aspects of macro-level and meso-level racial projects that explicitly or implicitly use their positions of relative power to create, shape, and influence racialised discourses around the notion of mixedness. The macro-level state censuses and subsequent reporting define and conceptualise versions of mixed race that each nation then officially recognises. Meanwhile the meso-level mixed race organisations produce and reproduce notions of mixed race though the positions of representation and advocacy that they define and construct.

This chapter provides a summary of the main findings and conclusions presented in the thesis. I also reflect on the wider implications of researching meso-level
organisations and the use of cross-national comparative study. Following, I reflect on the limitations of the study and the potential further research that will help to develop this important work on mixed race study further.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
In my analyses of macro-level and meso-level organisations, I found that there are significant differences in the ways that mixed race is constructed in the United States and Britain. Although superficially, “mixed race” is understood approximately in the same ways in both nations, examining the specific constructions that occur at the state and organisational levels reveal nuances in the ways that it is conceived and operationalised.

In Britain, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) created a “Mixed Ethnicity” category for the first time on the 2001 census, alongside the existing racialised categories developed for the 1991 census (“White,” “Asian or Asian British,” “Black or Black British,” and “Other”). The new category listed four sub-categories: “White and Black Caribbean,” “White and Black African,” “White and Black Asian,” and “Any Other Mix.” In their census reports, the ONS presents mixed race as specific and discrete groups, which were then compared to the other racialised groups in areas such as demography, socioeconomic status, and education levels and attainment. Creating specific racialised categories for mixed race provides legitimisation for the idea of racialised mixture as distinct and meaningfully different from the existing categories.

The ONS did not specifically seek consultation from mixed race organisations for the new categorisation. Nonetheless, the organisations generally welcomed the change and the representation that the categories signify for them. Although they approve of the mixed race options, they do have areas of contestation with other macro-level areas of government in the process of racial formation. These disagreements tend to be around government involvement through funding, mixed race representation, and in accessing social services. For example, some organisations are government funded, and thus are guided by the government
through commissioning, staffing, and monitoring. Other organisations are sceptical of government influence, preferring to be free to design the scope of their aims and outreach in the ways that they see fit. They may therefore fund their organisations through independent means to maintain their autonomy.

As meso-level sites, mixed race organisations also participate in the racial formation of mixedness. In contrast to the British macro-level constructions of mixed race, mixed race organisations in Britain tend to construct mixed race as a fluid conception that can include elements of more than one racialised, ethnic, and/or national identity. “Mixed race” is not necessarily confined to the racialised categories prescribed by the census. Although most of the British organisations view mixed race as a fluid concept, a minority focused specifically on Black and White mixed race. For these particular groups, they did not adopt a distinction between the “White and Black Caribbean” and the “White and Black African” racialised categories, as the ONS does. Rather, they were more rigid in their constructions of mixed race, in that they conceptualised it based on the broad, racialised categories of “Black” and “White.” Their constructions are discursively produced and reproduced through the uses of six meso-level mechanisms for racialisation: social identity, social capital, collective action, idioculture, external networks, and civil society.

In the United States, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) introduced the option to “mark one or more” for the race question on Census 2000. Enumerating for racialised mixedness is not new in US census history, but the ability to select more than one racialised category was new. Mixed race specifically is considered a combination of two or more of the discrete racialised categories. The OMB refrained from creating a new mixed race category, despite campaigning from a group of national mixed race organisations in the late 1990s. The decision to allow for the selection of multiple races instead of developing a “catch all” category suggests that the state was reluctant to add a new official racialised category to the existing designations. In this way, the state could attempt to appease those campaigning for official recognition and could report on the “Two or more”
population without having to upset the current racialised order by recognising mixedness as an entirely separate category. Additionally, the state functionally stops short of minoritising mixed race due to the way that it conceptualised mixed race.

The OMB categories were largely accepted by US meso-level organisations as a basis for their conceptions of race. Most meso-level representatives interviewed offered that “race is a social construction,” but despite this, many utilised biological and cultural paradigms of race to construct mixed race and justify the need for their organisations. Two organisations in particular expressed post-race desires to eventually see an end to racialised categorisation, and this position exposes the tension inherent in the use of racialised categories whilst wanting to be rid of them.

**Meso-Level Groups: Overlooked but Important**

Previously, explicit meso-level racial projects have been absent from racial formation analyses. My research has shown that meso-level racial projects are a necessary third category with an important and distinct role in processes of racial formation. There are specific mechanisms that occur at the meso-level that do not happen at the micro- and macro-levels.

In Chapters Five and Six, I examined how mixed race constructions occur through various combinations of social identity, social capital, collective action, idioculture, external networks, and civil society. Racialisation happens within the meso-level through the specific dynamics that are interactional and relational in nature; dynamics not typically seen at the macro-level. Through these interactions, meso-level groups are able to function as types of small-scale institutions. They are able to generate and express moderate influence and power that allow for mixed race constructions to be formed and contested on a scale not possible at the micro-level.

Through my interviews with the leaders of mixed race organisation in the United States and Britain, I have shown that the meso-level groups utilise strategies that
foster notions of shared identity around constructions of mixedness “created and inhabited” within the groups themselves (Omi and Winant 1994, 2002). I have explored how these strategies can be used to further express mixed race constructions within each group by means of support through social capital and/or collective action. Additionally, groups can use mechanisms of idioculture, external networks, and/or civil society to promote and contest mixed race constructions externally. Interactions with organisations—such as census, education, or health bodies—become sites for “transforming and destroying” racialised constructions (Omi and Winant 1994, 2002). Through my research, I have made a case that racial formation can be better understood through the specific exploration of these types of societal interactions.

**Mixed-Race: Furthering Race Theorisation**

As has been argued elsewhere (see, for example: Ali 2003; Garner 2010; Ifekwunigwe 2004; Parker and Song 2001), mixed race provides an important location for the examination of race theorisation more broadly. There has been an increasing body of work within “mixed race studies” over the last two decades. However, within more general race theorisation, racialisation of mixed race remains understudied as a particular focus. Subsequently, this remaining disconnect lessens the potential for generalised race theorisation to be informed and challenged by mixed race studies. The implications of this can be seen when examining the distinct ways that the United States and Britain racialised mixedness in the 2000 and 2001 censuses. In particular, my findings shed light on the underpinning logics of racialisation present in both nations. One of the salient issues drawn from my research is just how the notion of mixed race is officially conceived at the state level: as its own racialised category (as is done in Britain) or as a combination of racialised categories (as is done in the USA). This has implications for understanding the issues in racial theory around notions of racialised purity. In the case of Britain, creating a new racialised category supports the notion that racialised mixedness is substantively distinct from the other, supposedly pure, racialised categories. On the other hand, by refraining from creating a new category, the US allows for individuals to identify as more than one
racialised category. “Mark one or more” can be seen as challenging official separate conceptions of mixedness from the past (i.e., “Mulatto,” “Quadroon,” “Octoroon”) and broader notions of hypodescent, which throughout US history have denied acknowledgement of racialised mixture. Lingering influences of hypodescent may in part explain the ahistorical perceived novelty of mixed race behind the notion of the “mixed race baby boom.” A full understanding must account for how historical mixedness may have been overlooked due to hypodescent classifications and racialisation processes that generate notions of intergenerational fixedness of racialised categories. These questions do not readily arise when focusing on discrete racialised categories. Thus, addressing questions of mixedness further highlights the ideologies of racialisation and provides areas in which to better understand them in varying contexts.

Turning to the meso-level, I am not convinced that there is a significant paradigm shift occurring at meso-level sites, despite the centring of “mixed race” in their work. My research findings show that conversely, the meso-level discourses do not disrupt existing notions of race, but rather work to reify them. Some of the organisations claimed that by asserting a mixed race identity, this helps to disrupt the prevailing racial order that only acknowledges “monoracialism.” It is likely that the increased prevalence of mixed race organisations, alongside the change in racialisation categorisation at the macro-level, and popular and academic focus on mixed race, has encouraged visibility and acceptance of mixed race more broadly. Nonetheless, this has not led to meaningful challenges and changes to popular racial ideologies. I posit that part of the problem with arguments that notions of mixed race can offer a significant challenge to racialised orders is rooted in the erroneous assumption that mixed race is a new phenomenon. Racialised mixedness has had a presence throughout history in both the United States and Britain. Debates on whether mixed race people were “hybrids” or “mongrels” did little to challenge existing white hegemony. Official acknowledgement through US enumeration for mixed race during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries also did little to challenge the existing racialised order. History has shown that the mere acknowledgement of racialised mixedness does not in itself challenge racialised
ideologies. And indeed, contemporary racialised ideologies have not been disrupted by the increased acknowledgement and acceptance of mixedness in the wider society.

The mixed race organisations that I researched in both Britain and the United States continue to rely upon biological and cultural racial paradigms in order to understand their notions of mixedness. Particularly in the United States, organisations tend to rely upon aspects of the racialised ideology that have shaped racialised understandings since the trans-Atlantic slave trade. Although they assert at times that “race is a social construction,” they do not engage with social constructionist paradigms through their discursive practices. Frequently, they adopt the language of the macro-level racialised categories to explore mixedness without interrogating their meanings or without qualifying how social constructionism influences the ways they understand race and racialisation processes. In Britain, some mixed race discourses explored notions of mixedness that were not confined to the racialised categorisation of the state and explored the possibility for their conceptions of “mixed race” to include other forms of mixedness (e.g., nationalities, cultures, ethnicities). This shows some degree of engagement of social constructionism in their ideas of mixedness, as well as contesting the existing racialised notions of mixedness as the only recognised and significant form.

The conception of mixed race by mixed race organisations in both national contexts arrives to notions of “mixed race” through what Jill Olumide refers to as the “mixed race condition”; a set of characteristics that individuals identify with or exhibit because they are mixed race (Olumide 2002; see also Alibhai-Brown 2001; Frazier 2002; Ratliff and Sutherland 2015; Root 1992, 1996b for similar assertions). Particularly in Britain, but also found in the US, other organisations restricted their specific mixed race focuses to particular racialised combinations, which functions to further reify and essentialise mixedness as they address the “mixed race condition” of an even more specifically racialised group. Assuming a “mixed race condition” in the discourses of mixed race organisations is also an essentialising practice that further reifies notions of mixed race. In this way, meso-level
organisations are also functionally creating a mixed race category, distinct from others, instead of providing a significant challenge to existing racialisation paradigms.

Ultimately, my research has shown the great and continuing challenges in discussions and discourses around notions of mixed race. Even with the acknowledgement of racialised social construction, the continued use of racialised language continues to prove problematic. In the cases of Britain and the United States, this language is rooted in racialised ideologies that have been widely disproven and disavowed. Nevertheless, the remnants of those ideologies persist and contemporary understandings of race remain imbued with biological and cultural referents. Although academics carefully consider the socio-historical influences of racialised understanding, everyday usages are, understandably, not always as robust. As Joshua Glasgow describes:

> When I first mention to civilian friends and students that many academics think that race is nothing but an apparition, one common reaction is incredulity. To such a way of thinking, the fact that each of us has a race, or multiple or mixed races, is unassailable. […] […] One of my main concerns—a concern that…has been problematically ignored by many (myself included, at times)—is to account for, or at the very least confront in a richly informed way, commonsense [sic] thinking about race.


There is a disconnect between racialised paradigms in everyday and academic conversations. As Glasgow argues, everyday racialised thinking is strikingly complex in the ways that it uses biological paradigms to make sense of racialisation (Glasgow 2009). My research has illuminated some of this complexity in identifying the ways that biology and culture are still present, even when invoking social constructionist and post-race ideals. Part of the disconnect in what is meant through the invocation of racialised language is likely the use of the same historical terminology to connote different concepts. My research has shown the importance of focusing specifically on the way that the terms are being used in a particular context in order to understand the ways that race is operationalised at different levels of society, and the value in comparing these distinct constructions across time and space.
CROSS-NATIONAL RACIAL THEORISATION

My research findings support arguments made by Stephen Small that systematic cross-national comparison is a useful and important approach in the examination of racialisation processes (Bhattacharyya et al. 2002; Small 1994a, 2009; Small and King-O’Riain 2014). My findings have highlighted the particular ways that racial formation occurs at the state level through census processes and in mixed race organisations, as well as through the interactions between the two types of racial projects in the United States and Britain. This comparison framework provides a way to identify similarities and dissimilarities between the two nations (Small 1994a). Racialisation processes are necessarily situated within specific socio-historical processes; therefore, examining two national contexts especially highlights these influences in racial formation.

It might be expected that there would be parallels in the racial formation processes of the United States and Britain. Both countries made census enumeration changes that allowed for mixed race categorisation in the same census cycle. The surrounding “mixed race moment” that happened simultaneously in both nations fostered popular discussions of mixed race and provided the space for the development of mixed race organisations. However, the similarities that I found through my research were largely superficial. In both the United States and Britain, the macro-level and meso-level sites of my research participated in racialisation processes of mixedness. For the macro-levels, the similarity is merely that this is achieved through censuses that enumerate for racialised categorisation. The state, via the census, is not merely describing demographic data, but is producing discourses that function to construct specific racialisations of mixedness (Anderson 1991; Kertzer and Arel 2002; Nobles 2002). The ways this is done in the US and Britain sheds light on the ways mixed race is constructed similarly and differently within national contexts. For the meso-levels, mixed race organisations in both nations utilise combinations of the six mechanisms outlined in Chapter Five and Six to engage and construct racialised identities and meanings that are then reinforced within and without each organisation. As previously examined in the previous
chapters, organisations run by NW (GB) and HJ (US) both build social identity and social capital through locally-based organisations that focus on socialising and providing material and moral support to participants based on their identification as mixed race. Finally, in both nations, my findings show that there are interactions between the macro-level and meso-level racial projects in the negotiating and contesting of racialised meaning. Through the various influences, attempts at avoidance, and petitioning, mixed race constructions are “created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed” (Omi and Winant 1994, 2002).

As Stephen Small highlights in Racialised Barriers: The Black Experience in the United States and England in the 1980s (1994a) a problem that he found in research based in England is that it frequently borrowed uncritically from US and other sources in order to contextualise the specific situation in England. For US research, he critiqued that it rarely examined outside contexts at all. For the most part, this remains true for mixed race theorisation as well, in that work from Britain frequently references work from the US and other contexts (with varying levels of consideration for potential similarities and differences) and US research continues to neglect theorisation from other nations to inform and better understand its own. The result of this is an effective US Americanisation of mixed race theory that does not adequately reflect the specific processes happening in other contexts, or acknowledge the particularities in the US contexts that are not, in fact, universal.

LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

In considering the research project, the main limitations I have identified are around the issues of the accessibility and representativeness of the meso-level organisations I researched. In Chapter Three, I discussed my methods for identifying and selecting mixed race organisations, beginning with a content analysis of printed and electronic media that I used as a guide to selecting organisations for study. Whilst I attempted to be a thorough as possible, it is possible that I missed organisations that did not have a wide circulation of informational or publicity materials. Smaller organisations may have had older websites that either did not have much information on them, or became defunct or
otherwise un-navigable due to aging technology. As communication methods transitioned rapidly from print to electronic means during the time I conducted the interviews (between 2008-2011), organisations with no internet presence were likely “drowned out” by organisations that were more internet savvy. A result of this shifting technology is that smaller organisations with relatively fewer resources may not have been represented proportionately—or at all—during my identification processes. Furthermore, smaller organisations may have found it more difficult to participate in my research, due to limited, stretched resources allocated towards the daily running of the organisations. In the end, I did speak to some organisations with very small teams of three or fewer people, but the majority had more people involved in the running of the programmes, and thus more flexibility to participate in an interview.

The issue of representation is another issue where my research has limited applicability. Each of my interviews reflected the specific views of the participant(s) within his/her/their particular organisational, social, and personal context. As a result, the research is meant to investigate each organisation for its perspective. Then, it compares and synthesises the cases for each nation in order to identify emerging themes and issues that arise within each national context. As there was no way to conduct a complete census of every mixed race organisation in the United States and Great Britain for this research project, the data collected using purposive sampling and the resultant findings have limited generalisability that reflect the “snap-shot” timeframe within which the interviews occurred (Bloomberg and Volpe 2016; Palys 2008; Reybold et al. 2013). Regardless, the research remains an important contribution towards understanding the social processes of racialisation within meso-level groups and the particularities of these processes when comparing the United States and Great Britain. Within these discoveries, the research also raises potential areas for further investigation.

Moving forward from this research project, possible further study could include specific analyses of micro-level racial projects alongside the meso-level and macro-level racial projects. A smaller project that would complement the
macro-level/meso-level research herein would be a specific examination of meso-level/micro-level interactions to examine how non-state entities develop notions of mixedness. Additionally, the three levels could be examined together. This could be achieved by including research focusing on participants or clients of mixed race organisations to explore how individuals and families participate in and construct their own notions of racialisation and mixed race. Furthermore, this could illuminate how individuals and families potentially struggle against constructions articulated from macro-level and meso-level bodies. Within these further studies, analysing additional locations of discourse at the three social levels would help to provide a richer understanding of mixed race construction. Potential discursive sources include examining other areas of the state outside census production, news/mass media, social media, schools, the academy, families, or community spaces.

My research also invites the possibility for furthering the breadth of enquiry by conducting additional cross-national comparisons of racialisation processes and mixed race construction. As discussed throughout the thesis, the United States and Britain hold compelling reasons for comparability, but this by no means is exclusive to these two nations. Nations such as Canada, South Africa, and Brazil may be interesting to include in cross-national comparison of mixedness, due to their own respective substantial bodies of mixed race scholarship. Introducing cross-national perspectives would similarly benefit these bodies of knowledge through the refining of understanding of the processes particular to each national context, as well as identifying parallel processes that may have a more multi-national or global salience for mixed race studies worldwide. Conversely, systematically situating comparative research within nations with smaller bodies of mixed race scholarship, for example, the growing body of work on mixedness in Germany (e.g., Campt 2009; Essi 2014) and other nations/regions within Europe (Hine et al. 2009), Africa, Asia, Australasia, and Central and South America could examine specifically how mixed race construction shifts through influences of language, culture, and the particular racialisation processes unique to each country.
CONCLUDING COMMENTS

My research has begun to highlight and explore the ways that the initial shared socio-historical racialising events of colonisation and the trans-Atlantic slave trade have diverted to create and shape distinct constructions of mixedness in each nation. As explored throughout the thesis and overviewed in the summary of my findings above, the racial formation processes for mixed race are distinct in each nation. Despite some overlapping terminologies, adding mixed race census options, and the contemporary proliferation of mixed race discourses in popular media, the specific understandings and constructions of mixed race are dissimilar in their details. By examining Britain and the United States alongside one another, the profound role of socio-historical context on racial formation processes becomes clear. Through linking the macro-level to the meso-level constructions, I have highlighted the influences of the particular discourses the census employs in the ways it identifies mixed race. I have also examined the ways that macro-level engagement promotes and accommodates meso-level groups and the ways that the meso-level groups construct and promote their own constructions of mixed race alongside and/or in spite of official constructions. In comparing the two nations, it becomes reasonable to conclude that the specific ways that each site constructs mixed race and the particular interactions between them shape both the processes of racial formation and the differing aspects of racialisation. Racialisation theory specifically can be improved by continuing to examine specific contexts through systematic comparative study in order to highlight these particular unique mechanisms that shape mixed race and racialised categorisation more broadly.
References


McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald (eds.) (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.


213


Appendix A

UNITED STATES CENSUS SPECIMENS

Ethnicity and Race Questions, 2000

1. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? Mark the "No" box if not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.
   - No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
   - Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
   - Yes, Puerto Rican
   - Yes, Cuban
   - Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino — Print group.

2. What is your race? Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.
   - White
   - Black, African Am., or Negro
   - American Indian or Alaska Native — Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.
   - Asian Indian
   - Chinese
   - Filipino
   - Japanese
   - Korean
   - Vietnamese
   - Other Asian — Print race.
   - Some other race — Print race.

Source: US Census Bureau

Ethnicity and Race Questions, 2010

5. Is this person of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?
   - No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
   - Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
   - Yes, Puerto Rican
   - Yes, Cuban
   - Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — Print origin, for example, Argentine, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, and so on.

6. What is this person’s race? Mark one or more boxes.
   - White
   - Black, African Am., or Negro
   - American Indian or Alaska Native — Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.
   - Asian Indian
   - Chinese
   - Filipino
   - Japanese
   - Korean
   - Vietnamese
   - Other Asian — Print race, for example, Hawaiian, Polish, Filipino, and so on.
   - Other Pacific Islander — Print race.
   - Some other race — Print race.
ENGLAND AND WALES CENSUS SPECIMENS

Ethnicity Question, 2001

What is your ethnic group?

A White
- British
- Irish
- Any other White background, please write in

B Mixed
- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian
- Any other Mixed background, please write in

C Asian or Asian British
- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Any other Asian background, please write in

D Black or Black British
- Caribbean
- African
- Any other Black background, please write in

E Chinese or other ethnic group
- Chinese
- Any other, please write in

Ethnicity Question, 2011

What is your ethnic group?

16 Choose one section from A to E, then tick one box to best describe your ethnic group or background

A White
- English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
- Irish
- Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- Any other White background, write in

B Mixed/multiple ethnic groups
- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian
- Any other Mixed/multiple ethnic background, write in

C Asian/Asian British
- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Chinese
- Any other Asian background, write in

D Black/African/Caribbean/Black British
- African
- Caribbean
- Any other Black/African/Caribbean background, write in

E Other ethnic group
- Arab
- Any other ethnic group, write in

Source: Office for National Statistics
### Appendix B

**Profiles of Mixed Race Organisations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US-Based Representative(s)</th>
<th>Organisation(s) Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HJ</strong></td>
<td>Three interrelated organisations based in a major city. The first provides training for the parents (particularly White parents) in transracial adoptive families. The second is a local affiliate of a national group that has been prominent in the national campaign to allow for mixed race categorisation on the US Census. The third is a social group for mixed race people. Each group is led by a small team of people and reaches participants in the hundreds. The second and third groups target Black-White mixed race individuals and families, however they are not exclusive to that demographic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GH</strong></td>
<td>Organisation provides training, publications, and educational resources; predominantly targeted towards professionals in primary, secondary, and tertiary education. Led by GH, his reach is in the hundreds for the trainings and estimated thousands for his numerous publications. The focus of the group is open to any mixed race demographic, however the usual focus is on Black-White mixed race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DS</strong></td>
<td>One of the national groups that campaigned for mixed race representation on the US Census, specifically through the addition of a single mixed race category. Additionally, they campaign for a mixed race category on all government, educational, and other monitory forms in the US. The organisation is led by a small team and have a national reach of parents and families estimated to be in the tens of thousands. Sister organisation to the one run by CD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD</strong></td>
<td>One of the national groups that campaigned for mixed race representation on the US Census, specifically through the addition of a single mixed race category. Focusing specifically on outreach with mixed race teenagers and young adults, the small leadership team mobilises campaigns for representation on official monitoring forms and mixed race registration for bone marrow donation. Sister organisation to the one run by DS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TN</strong></td>
<td>National (with limited international reach) organisation that promotes “multicultural” community from all backgrounds and racialised designations. The founder, TN, with a small team, plans local events in multiple locations throughout the US to celebrate and commemorate the national legalisation of interracial marriage. Thousands of individuals and families are estimated to participate throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ</td>
<td>A small team produces an approximately quarterly national magazine focusing on Asian and Mixed Asian (domestic and abroad) issues and commentary. They have a modest subscriber base (less than one thousand), but the reach is estimated to be above that when including their supporting web and social media presence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB-BASED REPRESENTATIVE(s)</td>
<td>ORGANISATION OVERVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Founder XP develops educational materials, trainings, and community fora for teenaged mixed race students with Black and White parentage. He also mentors teenagers to further develop and facilitate trainings to their peers. The programmes run nation-wide, though largely concentrated in northern England. Several hundred students have been involved in the school trainings and around fifty students have participated in mentorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Internet-based community and support forum specifically for Black-White mixed race teenagers and adults. Though there is community participation and posting, content (news, opinion, reports) is primarily curated by LJ. Users are from around Britain and abroad, and the website averages around ten-thousand hits per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>A small, local community social and support group set up in southwestern England in partnership with local government. They meet regularly to talk about and explore their experiences of mixedness, particularly in their undiverse area. Any self-identified mixed race individuals or interracial families are welcome to attend. About ten to fifteen families are involved regularly, with approximately forty adults and children in attendance at each meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>A local organisation, run by a small team, that provides care for young children (up to five years old) in a multicultural borough in London. In addition to providing care for children, the organisation provides support and training for parents, including immigration, job-seeking, and liaising with local services as relevant. Approximately one hundred children participate in the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VY SF</td>
<td>A local, small team-run organisation located within a multicultural borough in London. The organisation provides care for young children under the age of five, and provides limited support for their parents. The organisation has under one hundred students in participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>A mental health services organisation located in a multicultural borough in London. Led by a small team, the organisation does outreach and provides mental health trainings, workshops, support, and monitoring for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) adults, aged 18-65; many of whom identify as mixed race. Additionally, they provide diversity/cultural training to voluntary and statutory organisations. On average, twenty to fifty adults attend the outreaches, and they have a caseload of around fifty adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>An organisation based in southeastern England that facilitates training and support for transracial adoptive parents, including those adopting mixed race children. A small team provides and facilitates support through training, family therapies, community with other adoptive families, and liaises with external local services as needed. The organisation manages a caseload of twenty to thirty families at a given time, and have served hundreds throughout its operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>